

PERIODICAL ROOM  
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SOUTHERN  
SOCIAL  
QUARTERLY

EDUCATIONAL  
SOCIAL  
SCIENCE

Vol. XXIV

DECEMBER, 1948

No. 3

INTERNAL IRISH ORGANIZATIONS  
IN THE  
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

WAR BOOM, TEXAS STYLE ..... *Loewe* 214

THE LAISSEZ-FAIRE STATE AND RELATIONSHIP TO THE  
NATIONAL ECONOMY ..... *Conrad M. H. Schaeffer, Jr.* 230

BOOK REVIEWS ..... 249

BOOK NOTES ..... 260

THE SOUTHERN  
SOCIAL SCIENCE  
SECTION

## BOARD OF EDITORS

*RUTH A. ALLEN, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF*

Office of Publication: 304 W. Fifteenth, Austin, Texas

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

*Accounting:* John A. White, University of Texas, Austin

*Agricultural Economics:* Otis Osgood, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

*Business Administration:* Perham C. Nahl, Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater

*Economics:* John O. Gragg, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos

*Geography:* Walter Hansen, North Texas State Teachers College, Denton

*Government:* C. W. Patten, Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee

*History:* Ralph H. Records, University of Oklahoma, Norman

*Psychology:* W. H. Breitlinger, University of Texas, Austin

*Sociology:* O. D. Duncan, Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Austin, Texas, under act of March 3, 1879.

The SOUTHWESTERN SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY is the official organ of the Southwestern Social Science Association. The subscription price of the QUARTERLY is three dollars a year or 75 cents a copy. Orders for subscriptions to the QUARTERLY may be addressed to Donald S. Strong, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. All manuscripts should be addressed to Ruth A. Allen, University of Texas, University Station, Austin, Texas. All books for review should be sent to O. Douglas Weeks, Book Review Editor, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

THE  
SOUTHWESTERN SOCIAL SCIENCE  
QUARTERLY

---

Vol. XXIV

DECEMBER, 1943

No. 3

---

Internal Irish Organizations During the  
Eighteenth Century

HOMER L. CALKIN

ARLINGTON, VA.

I.\*

Influence of a political, economic, or social nature is often exerted by groups which are quite unofficial in character. Small bodies of men in the form of loosely organized societies sometimes create a pressure which leads to unforeseen developments, far in excess of what might have been expected. During the American Revolution the Sons of Liberty were a powerful force in securing independence for the colonies. The Jacobins and Girondists were but two of the many organizations attempting to further their own ideas during the French Revolution.

However, America and France were not the first, nor the only, countries in which insurrectionary and revolutionary methods were used by the mass of the people in order to secure desired reforms. Internal agitation and insurrection were means known and used in Ireland very successfully before either the American or the French Revolutions began, and afterwards as well.

From 1760 until the time of the passage of the Act of Union in 1800 there was an almost constant procession of clubs and societies in the process of formation. Some played minor parts, while others were of great importance. To get a correct conception of the internal strife, dissatisfaction, and turmoil, all of these organiza-

\* Section II of this historical account will appear in a succeeding number.

tions must be considered. In nearly every one of the early instances the membership was sharply limited. Definite objectives, present at first, were often later forgotten. In an attempt to secure redress, excesses were indulged in with frightful results. Many times the government was forced to quell disturbances by force and also was obliged to make a somewhat satisfactory concession.

These Irish societies ran the gamut from ordinary fraternal organizations, such as the Masonic Lodge, to the blood-thirsty "Whiteboys"; from political groups like the Whig Club to large military organizations of "Volunteers." Memberships ranged from small groups to hundreds of thousands. Catholics, Protestants (Anglican), and Dissenters; peasants and property owners; farmers, merchants, lawyers; priests and parishioners; people from Ulster, Connaught, Leinster and Munster; all at some time or other were included in at least one of these organizations.

The reasons for organizing, the membership, the scope of the group's activities, its influence both direct and indirect, and other phases of each organization's history will be touched upon in the following sketches.

The first organization, which was the forerunner of many others, appeared in southeastern Ireland, centering in the counties of Tipperary, Wexford, Carlow and Kilkenny. The group was known first as "Levellers," as one of their chief occupations was levelling the hedges which had surrounded the commons. Later, the name was changed to "Whiteboys," from the white frock worn by the members at night. The movement started in the early 1760's,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sir Richard Musgrave said that, as early as 1756, men were being enlisted in an attempt to encourage a French invasion. Musgrave, Sir Richard, *Memoirs of the different Rebellions in Ireland from the arrival of the English*, 2nd edition, (Dublin, 1801), 34. However, it seems doubtful if any movement known either as "Levellers" or "Whiteboys" started that early. Young, Arthur, *Tour in Ireland* (1776-1778), edited by Arthur Wollaston Hutton, (London, 1892), 1:181, gives the date as not before 1760. Reynolds, Thomas, *The Life of Thomas Reynolds*, (London, 1839), 1:14, and Gordon, James B., *A History of Ireland from the Earliest Account to the Accomplishment of the Union with Great Britain in 1801*, (London, 1806), 2:210, give similar dates.

but it was not until 1762 and 1763 that the outbreaks became of noticeable importance.

The agitation, in its origin, was largely agrarian in character. The counties in which the outbreaks occurred served as the source of foodstuffs for the British navy. In the middle of the eighteenth century the prices of butter, beef, and similar products had risen sharply. This was due in part to the prevalence of murrain<sup>2</sup> which had started in Holstein and had spread from there to Germany and England, as well as to Ireland. As a result of the increase in prices, many large estates in Munster and Leinster were changed from tillage to pasturage. This had an almost immediate effect on the peasantry. With arable land being used for raising cattle, many people were without employment. Consequently, some migrated to other parts of Ireland. Those who remained found it difficult to maintain their hold in their tenancies as rent was high and wages offered were low. In addition to this, the inclosure movement had begun with the resultant removal of the right of commonage from the lower classes to whom the logical means of redress seemed to be to vent their wrath upon the land owners.

The movement, by some writers, has been considered as a religious conflict.<sup>3</sup> This seems hardly justifiable. True it is that the lower classes were almost entirely Roman Catholic while the land holders were Protestant. However, the sufferings that the peasantry endured were due to economic stress rather than to religious intolerance. As early as 1764 a declaration was read from the Catholic chapels stating that:

"We can only declare to these hellish emissaries that besides the ecclesiastical censures, which they have already incurred by their open threats of revenge and murder, we shall denounce them from our altars, we shall forbid them our chapels, and separate them from the communion of the faithful, being the most dreadful punishment that the church of God can inflict."<sup>4</sup>

Twenty years later, when Whiteboy pillagings began again, the members of the organization were denounced from Roman Catholic chapels throughout the diocese of Ossory.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> An infectious and fatal disease among cattle.

<sup>3</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 35.

<sup>4</sup> *Newport Mercury* (Rhode Island), No. 329, Dec. 24, 1764.

<sup>5</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:17.

The Whiteboy organization had only a few members at first, but membership increased rapidly. By 1762 it was possible for five hundred to a thousand to assemble at one time.<sup>6</sup> Usually, the number of raiders in a single group was small except when it was necessary to combat troops; then from five hundred to two or three thousand might assemble. After becoming partially organized, the early practice was "to demolish the fences of the common."<sup>7</sup> Later came the houghing and maiming of cattle, or else driving them far from the owner's estate. Then followed a series of atrocities directed against the landowners and their families in Leinster and Munster. Masters were forced to release apprentices, daughters of rich farmers were carried off and ravished into marriage.<sup>8</sup> Tongues were cut out; ears, noses, and lips were cut off; and people were otherwise disfigured. A common practice was to drag a man out of bed, make him ride naked for several miles, after which he would be flung into a pit lined with thorns; then dirt was filled in up to his neck. In this condition he was left to live or die, a matter of little concern to the Whiteboys.<sup>9</sup> Robberies were also committed; houses were burned; arms, horses, and money were seized. In fact, anything was done that was thought to be a means of getting revenge. Not only were the landowners preyed upon, but the tithe collectors were attacked.

The government was not slow in attempting to quell the uprisings. The Marquis of Drogheda, the Earl of Carrick, William Bagwell, and John Baginall of Tipperary were sent out with troops in 1763 and 1764 to put an end to further ravaging. A number of insurgents were killed by the troops, and others were caught for trial and convicted. On the whole, very few penalties were inflicted, as "want of evidence prevented punishment."<sup>10</sup> One notable exception was that of Nicholas Sheehy, an Irish priest at Clonmel. He was thought to have been the leader of the Whiteboys who were responsible for the murder of John Bridges, a Protestant. Therefore, he was taken up by the militia for trial, but he escaped before being brought before the court. However,

<sup>6</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 33.

<sup>7</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:15.

<sup>8</sup> Young, *op. cit.*, 1:81-3.

<sup>9</sup> *Newport Mercury*, No. 247, May 30, 1763; Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 32.

<sup>10</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 34; Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:17.

he promised to give himself up provided the trial would be held in Dublin. This was done, but lack of evidence prevented conviction. At a new trial held at Clonmel, Sheehy was sentenced to be hanged. Considered as a martyr to the cause of the peasantry, this Irish priest was held in the greatest veneration by the Catholic multitude.<sup>11</sup>

The attempts of the Marquis of Drogheda and others were at least partially successful. In 1764 a despatch from Waterford assured the public "that the insurrections of the White Boys are quelled in this part of the country."<sup>12</sup> For almost ten years, there was little disturbance; then in Wexford County, "the White Boys were violent for about three months in 1775." Almost immediately a spirited association of the gentlemen of that section suppressed them.<sup>13</sup> It was nearly another decade before further outbreaks occurred. In 1784 Rutland and Lord Sydney became concerned about the insurrection, this time centering mainly in Kilkenny County.<sup>14</sup> The presence of Volunteers acting as a police force in Ireland soon checked the outrages.<sup>15</sup>

The result of the Whiteboy movement was not entirely what the members might have desired. In the first place, they had "done infinite damage to the country."<sup>16</sup> The Irish government passed some legislation, but it was not satisfactory. Acts were passed against the Whiteboys in 1775 and were amended by additional acts two years later. An act was also passed to prevent the houghing of cattle in the future, but these laws were wholly unsuccessful.<sup>17</sup>

The opinion of some of the Protestant (Aglcian) element was that the further outbreaks in the 1780's proved "how necessary

<sup>11</sup> *Dictionary of National Biography*, 32:8.

<sup>12</sup> *Newport Mercury*, No. 334, Jan. 28, 1765. Despatch dated Oct. 20, 1764.

<sup>13</sup> Young, *op. cit.*, 1:92.

<sup>14</sup> Rutland to Lord Sydney and Sydney to Rutland, April 8 and 12, 1784. Historical Manuscripts Commission, 14th Report, Appendix Part I, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland*, (London, 1894), III:86-8.

<sup>15</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 43.

<sup>16</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine* (London), 1762, 182.

<sup>17</sup> 15 & 16 Geo. III, cap. 21; 17 & 18 Geo. III., cap. 49; and 18 & 19 Geo. III, cap. 31.

a numerous and well-armed police, consisting of protestants [Anglicans], is to the prosperity of Ireland."<sup>18</sup> There was Protestant (Anglican) objection to the act passed in 1778 (17 & 18 Geo. III., cap. 49) enabling Roman Catholics to take leases for 999 years. Some thought that "there is not a doubt, but that the Romanists had some hired agents in that assembly by this period. A strong argument in favor of an Union!"<sup>19</sup> None of these measures of the Irish Parliament solved the problem which had given rise to the outbreaks originally. In 1777 it was apparent that until "some step is taken in favor of tillage and the poor, Whiteboyism will probably remain in defiance of all the severities which the legislative power can devise, or the executive inflict."<sup>20</sup>

The Whiteboys had started some people to thinking of the need for remedying the conditions of the poor classes, others to objecting to further concession to the Catholics; but the failure of politicians to act upon either policy was to make the rebels determined to strive harder in the future for some change.

A movement of a very different nature was occurring in another part of Ireland at the same time as that of the Whiteboys in Munster and Leinster. The "Heart of Oaks," named from the oak boughs worn in their hats, appeared first in Armagh, followed by its appearance in Tyrone, Londonderry and Fermanagh counties.<sup>21</sup> The personnel included both Protestants and Catholics. The first uprising in Armagh County came in 1763 against the road act. In the repairing of roads, each house-keeper was required to furnish one man's labor and that of a horse, if he possessed one, for a period of six days during the year. The peasants felt that the burden of such work was put on the poorer classes and also that many of the roads were being used more for private than for public purposes. The Heart of Oak boys opposed the road tax, "the increase of rents" and "oppressive county cesses."<sup>22</sup> It seems that the cess in Armagh County did not exceed three half-

<sup>18</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 43.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>20</sup> Campbell, T., *A Philosophical Survey of the South of Ireland*, (London, 1777), 313.

<sup>21</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:17-18.

<sup>22</sup> Gordon, *History of Ireland*, 2:245; Young, *op. cit.*, 1:124.

pence in any barony, "so that whatever may have happened must have all proceeded from the suggestions and insinuations of incendiary and insidious emissaries, who delight in raising disorder among the unthinking and unwary wherever they come."<sup>23</sup>

Very little damage except for the maiming of cattle, was done. With daytime meetings replacing night maraudings, little personal violence was indulged in. However, oaths, not to demand so large a tithe as had been claimed formerly,<sup>24</sup> were administered to the clergy by the Heart of Oak members. Soon they began to extend their activity to prevent landlords from collecting such high rents as usual, especially from the bogs. On July 4, 1763, in Armagh County, 10,00 oakboys assembled; if any one refused to go where he was asked, he was immediately "made to ride a mile upon a stick" and "was heartily ducked."<sup>25</sup>

The government sent several bodies of royal troops to Ulster and soon put an end to the actions of the Heart of Oaks. One of the first to check them was Captain Rankin, in the county of Londonderry. Establishing himself at Castledawson with a small body of men, he "by extraordinary courage and conduct, stopped the insurgents in that quarter without the effusion of blood." The whole movement was put down with the loss of only three or four lives and not much destruction of property.<sup>26</sup> The government then repealed the act which had caused much of the trouble.<sup>27</sup> Far less bloody than the Whiteboys and of much shorter duration, the Heart of Oaks, nevertheless, had their effect. By united action, Ulstermen found that it was possible to coerce the clergy and others to meet their demands and also to force government to action. This was to give great impetus to the United Irishmen in the 1790's when they were organized in Ulster.

Scarcely had Ulster become settled following the outburst of the Heart of Oaks than another movement appeared. Known as the Heart of Steel Boys, signifying a firmness of resolution, the

<sup>23</sup> *Newport Mercury*, No. 269, Oct. 31, 1763.

<sup>24</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:18.

<sup>25</sup> *Newport Mercury*, No. 264, Sept. 26, 1763.

<sup>26</sup> Gordon, *op. cit.*, 2:245-6.

<sup>27</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:18.

agitation started in Antrim County, spreading quickly into Londonderry, Donegal and Tyrone counties. The membership was chiefly Presbyterian peasants, centering around a group who had been forced to give up their lands on the estate of Marquis Donegal. On a part of this land, "it is proposed, when its leases expired, to let only to those who could pay large fines [rents]" and thus increase the rents. The former tenants were able to pay neither the large fines nor the increased rent demanded by those who had paid the fees to the landlord.<sup>28</sup> Becoming desperate from lack of subsistence, they banded together and began to maim the cattle of those who had taken their lands. Before long, it was supposed that in each of the four northern counties there were more than 15,000 men known as Steel Boys. At night they would assemble, "march . . . through the country, take all the arms and ammunition they can find, go among the great gentlemen and land holders, and oblige them to swear never to set their lands at above twelve shillings an acre."<sup>29</sup>

One group became so bold as to go to Belfast and remove one of their members who had been taken prisoner by the military guard.<sup>30</sup> A number were arrested by the troops at Carrickfergus, but a supposed partiality of witnesses and juries brought about an acquittal. The Irish government in March, 1772, passed an act which permitted trial in a county different from the one in which the crime was committed. Some of the Steel Boys were taken, therefore, to Dublin but were acquitted there also because of a feeling that the act was unconstitutional. Under the Earl of Harcourt, the act was repealed in December, 1773. However, "insurgents, tried in their respective counties, were now condemned and executed" as government officials and the judiciary realized that continued disorder might lead to further insurrection.<sup>31</sup>

Although these executions put an end to the movement, the effect of it was long to be felt by Great Britain. From 1771 to 1773 great numbers emigrated from Ulster to America and fought

<sup>28</sup> Gordon, *op. cit.*, 2:250.

<sup>29</sup> *Newport Mercury*, No. 717, June 1, 1772.

<sup>30</sup> Lecky, W.E.H., *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, (New York, 1893), 2:50.

<sup>31</sup> Gordon, *op. cit.*, 2:251.

on the side of the colonies. Nor was this all. The dissenting Presbyterians who remained were filled with the ideas of republicanism and separation.

Replacing the Whiteboys in 1786 were the Right Boys, so designated because they took an oath of allegiance to Captain Right.<sup>32</sup> Starting in Kerry County, the movement spread over most of Munster. Although the membership was composed of only the lowest classes of peasantry, there seemed to be indications that some more intelligent group was directing the movement. Opposition by this organization was directed toward the tithe. It seemed apparent that the land owners were fostering the idea, not for the benefit of their tenants, but so that more money might be gotten from the rack-rents.<sup>33</sup>

At first the Right Boys assembled in large bodies, several hundreds, or even thousands; they marched through the country unarmed and offered no resistance if a magistrate should seize any of their members. The Right Boys believed that they should not pay more than a fixed tithe per acre and should not permit tithe proctors.<sup>34</sup> As long as this was all they demanded, the government did not interfere although the Protestant clergy in Cork County became intimidated and fled to the city of Cork for protection.<sup>35</sup> Finding little trouble in making threats against the tithe, the Right Boys "proceeded to fix limits to rents, to oppose the collection of hearth-money, and to treat with the most horrid barbarity such persons as were obnoxious to them."<sup>36</sup> At that time, government interfered. An act was passed in 1787 making illegal the banding together of such combinations. This put an end to another organization which had helped to increase the turmoil in Ireland.

The most important of the earlier Irish organizations was the Volunteers, a large military association brought about by the need for protection in 1778. With a substantial number of Irish

<sup>32</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 44.

<sup>33</sup> Gordon, *op. cit.*, 2:299; Seward, *W. W. Collectanea Politica*, (Dublin, 1801), B:82.

<sup>34</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:39.

<sup>35</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 44.

<sup>36</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:40.

troops fighting in America, it became necessary to raise more troops to prevent the invasion which France and Spain were threatening. In 1775 a group of gentlemen had volunteered in Wexford County to put down a Whiteboy insurrection. Now the same plan was extended throughout Ireland. In August, 1778, the people of Belfast were asked to raise troops there in case of an invasion.<sup>37</sup> In sort time, recruits began flocking "to the new standard in great numbers and with alacrity."<sup>38</sup> Before long, a total of about 100,000 had enlisted, more than one third of whom were located in Ulster.<sup>39</sup>

The Volunteers were Protestant in origin and remained so during the entire period of their existence.<sup>40</sup> Some Catholics were admitted, but, on the whole, did not join actively. This did not however prevent them from applauding the movement and giving it support both financially and morally.<sup>41</sup> The idea of volunteering "spread like lightning" among all classes with noblemen and gentlemen, such as the Earl of Charlemont, the Earl of Bristol, and the Duke of Leinster, taking command.<sup>42</sup> At first each person supplied his own uniform and arms, but the government soon stepped in and furnished several thousand arms. Although acting as independent units until the middle of 1780, the corps were effective and fulfilled their purpose adequately. It seems certain that the Volunteers "deterred the French from attempting an invasion of the kingdom, . . . and they completely preserved the peace of the country." At all times, respect was shown for law, and enforcement of the laws was carried out.<sup>43</sup>

By 1780 the threat of French encroachment upon Irish shores was gone, but the government was not able to disperse the group

<sup>37</sup> Madden, Richard Robert, *The United Irishmen, Their Lives and Times*, (London, 1842), II:290.

<sup>38</sup> MacNevin, T., *History of the Volunteers of 1782*, 5th Edition, (Dublin, 1853), 76.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 222.

<sup>40</sup> Falkiner, C. Litton, *Studies in Irish History and Biography, mainly in the eighteenth Century*, (London, 1902), 25.

<sup>41</sup> MacNevin, *op. cit.*, 84. The Catholics of Limerick gave £800.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 82; Stanhope, Philip Henry, *Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt*, (London, 1861-2), 1:260.

<sup>43</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 47; Tomline, George, *Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt*, (London, 1821), 2:459.

as easily as they had been gathered. O'Neill moved on October 9, 1781, that the thanks of the Irish House of Commons be given to the Volunteers "for their exertion and continuance, and for their loyal and spirited declaration on the late expected invasion."<sup>44</sup> The year before, it was known that the Irish government felt that it was time to "demolish the Volunteers. This is a good reason for caution, but none for not pursuing the measure."<sup>45</sup> The attempt at disbandment was not successful, and officials began to fear the possibilities of having an extra-legal force in Ireland. W. W. Grenville told the Earl of Shelburne that the Volunteers had "the means of resisting any law they disliked."<sup>46</sup> Various requests were made by the Volunteers, and it was not thought proper to discard them outright. Pointing to conditions in the American colonies, frequent references were made to the treatment given to the demands of the colonists for rights. For instance, leaders in the Irish Parliament were warned to "think of the consequences of that kind of treatment of the American petitions,"<sup>47</sup> which had been ignored by the British Parliament.

Because of the military character of the organization, it was necessary to meet often in order to drill. With danger from foreign powers gone, attention was turned almost at once to domestic problems. Since the group comprised the educated and leading men in Ireland, it seemed almost natural that they should begin to think of solutions for these other matters of concern. If any extra-legal body, such as the Volunteers, could take care of the problem of defense, why could not the same group bring about a solution of governmental issues? A meeting of the Volunteer Corps was held at Dublin, Dec. 30, 1781. At that time, a resolu-

<sup>44</sup> *Parliamentary Register of Ireland*, 1:8-10; Taylor, G., *History of the Rise, Progress, and Suppression of the Rebellion*, (Dublin, 1829), 7.

<sup>45</sup> Wm. Knox to William Eden, Dec. 18, 1780. Stevens, Benjamin Franklin, *B. F. Steven's facsimiles of manuscripts in European Archives relating to America, 1773-1783*, (London, 1889-95), No. 745.

<sup>46</sup> W. W. Grenville to Lord Temple, Dec. 15, 1782. Buckingham & Chandos, Duke of, *Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of George the Third. From original family documents*, (London, 1855), 1:85-90.

<sup>47</sup> Burton Conyngham to Beresford, Jan. 13, 1784. Beresford, John, *The Correspondence of the Right Hon. John Beresford, Illustrative of the last thirty years of the Irish Parliament*, edited by William Beresford, (London, 1854), 1:247-8.

tion was passed in favor of free suffrage. They paid tribute to the parliamentary members who had attempted to repeal the law vesting control of a perpetual army in the Crown and to free the "legislature from unconstitutional interference" and to secure some portion of free trade.<sup>48</sup>

The Newry and Kilkenny Volunteers sent thanks to Henry Grattan, Henry Flood and Eland Massom. Is it to be wondered that the ego of the Volunteers should be increased by the answers of leaders of Irish public opinion? Flood replied in part:

"The Volunteers of Ireland have crowned these excellencies [valor in the field and steadiness of honour] by that manly love of constitution, which is the first civil duty and the greatest ennobler of every other virtue. With such men I am proud to associate in asserting the rights of Ireland, and in endeavouring to sustain the glory of the British name."<sup>49</sup>

Massom said that the Volunteers of Ireland "are certainly to consider themselves the great palladium of her liberties and safety."<sup>50</sup>

On December 28, 1781, the 1st Regiment of Volunteers in Ulster followed the example of the various Leinster corps and met at Armagh. At that time it was decided that all the corps in Ulster were to send delegates to a meeting to be held at Dungannon, in County Tyrone. At this gathering 143 corps sent some of their members to discuss parliamentary reforms.<sup>51</sup> They declared that "we seek our rights, and no more than our rights."<sup>52</sup> They proceeded to adopt the famous Dungannon Resolutions which were "virtually a declaration of war."<sup>53</sup> At once, corps throughout Ireland adopted the resolutions. So strong was sentiment in favor of them that on February 22, 1782, Grattan brought his motion in the Irish House of Commons for an address to the King declaring the rights of Ireland based largely on these declarations of the Volunteers. In this manner, the first major design of the Volunteers was accomplished.

<sup>48</sup> *Dublin Evening Post*, No. 614, Jan. 5, 1782.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:24-5.

<sup>52</sup> MacNevin, *op. cit.*, 160.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

The next year, 1783, forty-five corps met at Lisburne in County Down to consider further reforms. They thought that "all possible Cause of Jealousy between the Sister Kingdoms" had been removed and "united us to Britain on the Basis of equal Liberty and Similar Constitution." Now it was necessary to restore vigor to the constitution by means of a reform of parliamentary representation.<sup>54</sup> The Lisburne convention wrote to Charlemont to see if he favored a reform movement. He answered, "a reform in the representation of Ireland is a measure which most certainly meets with my warmest approbation."<sup>55</sup> There was, however, one drawback. Some of the members of parliament desired that the enfranchisement should be extended to include Roman Catholics. Charlemont gave a "decided opinion of his disapprobation of admitting Roman Catholics to any right of voting," and at once the Volunteers were divided.<sup>56</sup> Under Henry Flood reform measures were introduced into the Irish Commons but suffered a three to one defeat.<sup>57</sup>

Gradually, the Volunteers began to deteriorate. In 1784 several corps held instruction periods for people of all ranks and religious persuasions in the use of arms.<sup>58</sup> Reviews and parades were held for a number of years, but no longer was much power exerted. In 1792 the Society of United Irishmen at Dublin addressed the Volunteers of Ireland in an attempt to get them to join the organization. First praising them for past accomplishments, they ended by saying:

"We have addressed you, citizen soldiers, on this subject [universal reform and representative legislature] from the belief that your body, uniting conviction with zeal, and zeal with activity, may have much influence over your countrymen, your relations and friends."<sup>59</sup>

<sup>54</sup> *Letter from the Committee of Ulster Volunteers to the Duke of Richmond, (1783), 2.*

<sup>55</sup> Hardy Francis, *Memoirs of the Political and Private Life of James Caulfield, Earl of Charlemont*, 2nd Edition, (London, 1812), 2:97.

<sup>56</sup> Rutland to Pitt, July 24, 1785. Pitt, William, *Correspondence between the Right Honourable William Pitt and Charles Duke of Rutland, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1781-1787*, (Edinburgh, 1890), 24, 26.

<sup>57</sup> Stanhope, *op. cit.*, 1:260.

<sup>58</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 50.

<sup>59</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 2:550-4.

However, not many joined for the day of activity for the Volunteers was over. Largely through their efforts, an attempted solution of the problem of empire had been adopted by England in 1782, but it was for other people to carry out further changes in imperial government. They were not to participate in the movement of United Irishmen which was to go further than any other group in seeking separation from England and thus arouse the realization of the need for a closer union of Ireland with England.

In 1786 began what later became a "downright religious war." The Peep-of-day Boys and Defenders started from a dispute between two men; soon large numbers of Presbyterians and Roman Catholics were included. Neither group missed an opportunity of levelling hostility against the other. The whole matter was fomented by country gentlemen who espoused one side or the other.<sup>60</sup> The Catholics, or Defenders, collected arms, and the Peep-of-Day Boys took them away. The latter was often "guilty of wanton excesses, both on the person and property of their antagonists."<sup>61</sup> Troops were sent to Armagh to quell the disturbance; in spite of this, the Defenders continued to be heard from; likewise, the Peep-of-day Boys, known also as "Protestant Boys" and "Wreckers," were still active; and the religious war was continued.

"Neutrality was impossible; every man was obliged to embrace one or the other party, if he did not desire to be shunned, hated, and persecuted by both."<sup>62</sup> The Defenders started chiefly in Ulster in an attempt to protect themselves from any increase in the power and influence of the Presbyterians. Gaining numbers there, the movement spread throughout Ireland, even to distant County Kerry. The Defenders were organized on a military plan in which an oath was administered that "they would be faithful to the United Nations of France and Ireland."<sup>63</sup>

Especially in 1792 and 1793, attacks, pillagings and murders of Protestants of all denominations were carried on. In Louth County alone, 180 houses were plundered. In some places land-

<sup>60</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 54-6.

<sup>61</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 1:40.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

lords were compelled to relinquish rents, and clergy their tithes. Many families abandoned their homes and fled to Dublin for protection under the government.<sup>64</sup> Troops were sent into the north to crush the Catholic organization; the most decisive battle was that of "the Diamond" on September 21, 1795, in which the Defenders were defeated.<sup>65</sup> More than ever was realized the importance of a strong, reliable militia if Ireland were to avoid repetition of those outbreaks.

Orangeism has been defined by some as "protestantism run mad."<sup>66</sup> The Orangemen's avowed purpose was "to stand forward in defence of that grand palladium of our liberties, the constitution of Great Britain and Ireland, obtained and established by the courage and loyalty of our ancestors under the great King William."<sup>67</sup> The Orangemen gained impetus in 1797 when the Defenders and United Irishmen began increasing their outrages. The Orangemen of Dublin, "from the various attempts that have been made to poison the public mind, and slander those who have had the spirit to adhere to their king and constitution, and to maintain the laws" felt it was necessary to "openly avow those principles, and to declare to the world the objects of our institution."<sup>68</sup>

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 40-3; *Cf. Annual Register*, 35:1 of chronicle.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>66</sup> Largely Anglican rather than Dissenter in character. The Presbyterians were chiefly in the United Irishmen at this time.

<sup>67</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, App. V, 3; "Veridicuss," *A Concise account of the Material Events and Atrocities which occurred in the Late Rebellion*, 3rd Edition, (Dublin, 1799), 84-5.

<sup>68</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, App. V, 13. The declaration of the Orangemen included the following:

"We have long observed with indignation the efforts that have been made to foment rebellion in this kingdom by the seditious, who have formed themselves into societies, under the specious name of United Irishmen.

"We have seen with pain the lower orders of our fellow subjects, forced or seduced from their allegiance, by the threats and machinations of traitors.

"And we have viewed with horror the successful exertions of miscreants, to encourage a foreign enemy to invade this happy land, in hopes of rising into consequence on the downfall of their country.

"We, therefore, thought it high time to rally around the constitution, and there pledge ourselves to each other, to maintain the laws, and support our good king against all his enemies, whether rebels to their God or to their country. . . .

"We further declare, that we are ready at all times to submit ourselves to the orders of those in authority under his Majesty, and that we will cheerfully undertake any duty which they shall think proper to point out for us, in case

Originating as a defense group, their object was to maintain social order, and to protect the lives and property of the King's subjects from the spirit of anarchy.<sup>69</sup> Only in Armagh did they take an active offensive. To the Catholic organizations the word Orange-man was "but the war whoop for the butchery of Protestants."<sup>70</sup> It was the Orangemen who opposed Union most, fearing the possibility of the Catholics securing the franchise.

Of an entirely different nature from the Defenders and United Irishmen was the Catholic Committee. Using peaceful means instead of force, they were attempting to secure the restoration of the privileges of which they had been deprived by the penal laws. The Catholic Society of Dublin passed a resolution to this effect:

"Resolved, That we will, to the utmost of our power, endeavour by all legal and constitutional means to secure the repeal of the laws by which we are aggrieved as Roman Catholics.—That we will promote repeated applications to every branch of the legislature for that purpose; and assist such applications by all means of legal influence, which it shall at any time be possible for us to exert."<sup>71</sup>

This organization had been in existence during the greater part of the eighteenth century. In 1783, it had declared that every Roman Catholic nobleman and gentleman of landed property was considered as a member. Throughout, a spirit of mildness and moderation prevailed.<sup>72</sup> In 1793 the committee was "grieved to hear of the success of designing men in agitating the minds of the lower order of their persuasion in a part of this country, and filling them with apprehensions of danger from the Protestant brethren."<sup>73</sup> The group further felt it was necessary "to warn the body at large against any attempts of pretended friends or declared enemies to mislead them, to drive them into a violence

---

either a foreign enemy shall dare to invade our coasts, or that a domestic foe shall presume to raise the standard of rebellion in the land. To these principles we are pledged, and in support of them we are ready to shed the last drop of our blood."

<sup>69</sup> "Veredius," *op. cit.*, 38.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>71</sup> *Northern Star* (Belfast), Jan. 4, 1792.

<sup>72</sup> Musgrave, *op. cit.*, 76-8.

<sup>73</sup> Seward, *op. cit.*, 2:344-5.

derogatory to their unspotted character of loyalty and obedience to the laws, or subversive of the unanimity which ought to subsist amongst every description of Irishmen."<sup>74</sup>

The Catholics, acting through their committees, resorted to petitions rather than to violence in order to attain their desired concessions. Repeatedly their wishes were transmitted either to the King or to parliament. They felt that they had been subject to "pains and penalties of an extent and severity which scarce any degree of delinquency can warrant, and prolonged to a period when no necessity can be alleged to justify their continuance." Among other causes for complaint were enumerated the following: "We are disabled from serving our Majesty in any office of trust and emolument whatsoever, civil or military"; "We are interdicted from all municipal stations, and the franchise of all guilds and corporations"; "We may not found nor endow any university, college, or school for the education of our children"; "We are totally prohibited from keeping or using weapons for the defense of our houses, families, or persons, whereby we are exposed to the violence of burglary, robbery, and assassination"; and "*We are deprived of the elective franchise*, to the manifest perversion of the spirit of the constitution, inasmuch as your faithful subjects are thereby taxed where they are not represented, actually or virtually, and by laws, in the framing of which they have no power to give or withhold their assent." Therefore, the 234 Catholic delegates from seventy-three Irish governmental divisions hoped "that your Majesty, in your paternal goodness and affection towards the numerous and oppressed body of your loyal subjects, may be graciously pleased to recommend to your Parliament of Ireland, to take into their consideration the whole of our situation, our numbers, our merits, and our sufferings."<sup>75</sup> Had the committee been permitted to have its way, instead of seeing its followers resort to violence, thus arousing the Protestant element, it might well have succeeded in its aim.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>75</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 11:542-7.

## War Boom, Texas Style

HARRY E. MOORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Out of the war effort new types of communities are emerging and beginning to take shape in Texas, and other areas where large troop concentrations and new industrial communities are being built, almost overnight. If it be true, as has often been said, that the community is the proper subject for the study of sociologists, then here is a laboratory such as few of us would have dared to hope for a few years ago. Here, we have the opportunity to observe in the space of a few months, or a year or so at most, a process of urbanization which normally would be spread over decades even in the faster-growing region of the Southwest. Here is an opportunity to see what effect a sudden and large increase in population has on the school, the church, the family, the economic and governmental institutions by which we seek to regulate our activities and to provide satisfactions for our basic desires. But, as important, we also have here a chance to observe changes in basic attitudes and values which are expressed through such institutions.

These communities, however, are obviously not entirely like the older towns and cities which we hope to understand better by observing what is happening in the "boom town" of today. The very fact of their rapid growth may mean that we have here something more than a mere compression in time of the usual processes; perhaps the time element is important. Further, these communities are composed of a population displaying characteristics very unlike those of the older communities. The new population is, ordinarily, predominantly male and in the younger productive period of life—although in some of the munitions areas the new population is predominantly female. This, in itself, would tend to throw serious doubt on the applicability of the findings of studies of such places to the more ordinary sort of town.

Also, few if any of these towns have grown up *de novo*. In almost every case there has been some sort of hamlet, village, or

even city, to which the new population has been added. These communities had their institutions and their attitude-value structures well established and functioning on some sort of a tolerable basis. These elements will be found in the new situation. Indeed, the core of the problem to be attacked, it seems, is the impact of a vast increase in population, with attendant "new" or different attitudes and values upon the existing social structures.

In an attempt to study these changes, the Bureau of Research in Social Science and the Research Institute of The University of Texas made a small grant in the spring of 1942 for the study of changes coincident with the coming of any army camp to the area dominated by the towns of Bastrop and Elgin, each of about 2,000 population. The army camp is situated between the villages, about six miles from the first and eight miles from the second. Due to lack of ample funds, it was found necessary to confine the study largely to the town of Bastrop.

Bastrop was chosen for this study solely because of its nearness to The University of Texas at Austin. Within the limits of the state there were some seventy-five defense areas, some of which certainly would have been more spectacular and others a study of which might have been of more value. The original plan contemplated making investigations in some twelve or fifteen of these communities, selecting those to be studied so as to include various types of background, size before the boom, types of industry or camp, and similar criteria. Since funds were not obtainable for such a project, Bastrop was selected because of its availability.

No elaborate methods were worked out in advance of the study. A generalized statement of the purpose was drawn up and this was supplemented by a somewhat more detailed description of the types of data desired and the probable sources of such data. The purposes were those stated in summary form above.

The method of procedure was first to compile and tabulate such information as was available from census reports, local and state histories, articles in magazines and journals, and similar studies. Newspapers from the towns and large cities of the state were combed for references to the camp construction. This was of

especial value since actual construction work had begun before the field study was under way. The core of the study consisted of investigations of two field workers who spent some time in the community.\* These persons were asked to live in the town of Bastrop, to take part in as many of the community activities as might be possible and to observe the types of data set forth in the original statement of purposes. They were given a minimum of detailed supervision on the theory that they would be better able to work out details of methods on the ground and in intimate touch with the data than would have been possible by others at a distance.

It must be admitted at once that the staff was too small, and that observations tend to be fragmentary as a result of this fault. It is obvious, too, that the field workers should have been in the town before construction work began. This was recognized, but since they could not be secured until funds were available, this lack was unavoidable.

This paper will concern itself with observations made during the period of the construction boom and immediately afterwards. The period of construction began in February and had been pretty well completed by June, though some construction was still in progress at that date and showed signs of continuing on a relatively minor scale for some months more. But by the first of June the "boom" was over and the town settled back to take a few deep breaths before the arrival of the troops.

As a point of reference, it is necessary to sketch the village of Bastrop as it existed before the announcement that an army camp would be located nearby. Bastrop was a village of 1976 persons when the 1940 census was taken. It is the seat of the county of

\* Dr. Bertha Duncan, a college teacher of mental hygiene and psychology in general, was loaned to the project for a period of six weeks during the period of camp construction. Mr. Harold Garfinkel, who had just completed his work for the Master of Arts degree at the University of North Carolina was engaged for the period from March 15 to September 1, the date of expiration of the grant. Mr. W. Gordon Browder, research assistant in the Bureau mentioned above was in direct charge of the project, though this responsibility was shared by a committee of three faculty members, of whom the writer was the more active one.

same name, located in south central Texas, in the valley of the Colorado River.

The wealth of the county, and village, has been in agriculture predominantly. In 1940 the county produced 6,015 bales of cotton as part of a diversified farming program. Pasturage is provided in the forests of the county for cattle, which form one of the important assets.

The town of Bastrop is located near the center of the county. For the region it is an old town, first settled in 1828, nine years before the county was organized. It has served as a shopping and shipping center for an agricultural area throughout its history. No industries of importance are located within or near the municipality.

Also within the county, and lying near the cantonments, are two other towns, Elgin and Smithville. The latter is the largest town in the county, with a population of 3,100 in 1940. Elgin had a population of 2,008. Both towns are primarily agricultural markets. No other town in the county had a population of 500 in 1940.

A very slow drift of persons from the farmlands to the towns is indicated by the changing percentages of urban and rural population during this century. In 1900 the county was 90.4 per cent rural; by 1940 this figure had dropped to 85.7. Likewise the Negro population, identified largely with farm work, had decreased from 38.6% in 1900 to 32.4% in 1930, the latest figure available. Density of population also decreased during this period, indicating a migration out of the county. Age distribution displays an elderly population pattern with less than four per cent of the population found in any of the five-year groups above twenty and with almost two per cent in the sixty to sixty-five year and sixty-five to seventy year groups.

A resident of the village remarked that twenty years ago Bastrop was a finished product. It might be added that since that time, it had begun to suffer from dry rot. Early prosperity had resulted from the growing of cotton in the rich river lands. This had been supplemented by the mining of the pine and cedar forests, and for

a time following World War I, of lignite. But the growing of cotton had become unprofitable, the timber resources were exhausted and the users of lignite turned to cheaper oil and gas. These events left the town without any secure economic base and drove the residents to an introspective idealization of the days of former glory. The young people of the villages commonly left for larger towns, the lads from the farms moved into the villages for long or short stays as filling station attendants or as clerks in stores before moving on toward the larger cities of the state. The Bastrop school system adopted a policy of encouraging graduates to return for a year or more of "post graduate study in order to prepare them better" for opportunities which actually did not exist. Merchants agreed that no one made any money, but neither did any one go broke. What business there was was shared, not through competition but through an elaborate system of reciprocities. As the editor of the weekly newspaper put it, "We all got along doing each other's laundry." An effort had been made to secure more trade for the community by inauguration of a monthly "Trades Day," but it was obvious that such a device could be of limited value only.

As might be expected, this situation resulted in a great deal of value being placed on social activities. The women of the village laid great stress on "background," on literary activities, on bridge clubs and similar time-killing occupation. But as the depression deepened, these means of asserting status declined. The formal affairs became less important and were held less often. The descendants of German-speaking residents found themselves more and more accepted, partly because they had come to possess a larger share of the economic resources in land and business. At the same time, business men adopted and adhered to a rigid, though unwritten, code of ethics. Business was conducted not so much for profit, as for profit within the limitations of a "live and let live" ethic. Much emphasis was placed on being a "man of principle," and one made money in a dignified and decent manner or one did not make it at all. Indeed, business was a more or less casual matter. Customers expected the merchant to render various small gratuituous services; stores were used as meeting places for idle conversation or for leisurely checker or domino games; or if some one brought word that the fish were biting in the river, or

was inclined to play golf for an afternoon in the nearby state park, the customers were not at all discommoded by finding the man with whom they wanted to transact business out and his store closed. Merchants and officials felt free to regulate their affairs and those of the community as they saw fit. For example, when it was learned that the army camp would be constructed, a representative of a union arrived in town and began to take applications for membership. One of the officials explained that he sent an officer "to see what was up" and started to "run the fellow out of town," but did not do so for fear that local persons would be injured by being deprived of future jobs.

All of this, of course, was in direct contrast to the ethics and manners of the merchants who came into the village with the announcement of the camp and who, by virtue of their position, came into direct contact with the older ruling class.

When news came, late in 1941, that the camp would be built, it was greeted with mixed feelings by the residents of Bastrop. These people generally felt that it would revive the town and bring a prosperity such as had never been enjoyed. At the same time, however, the changes which it was realized would accompany such an event, were dreaded. Just what the changes to come would be, or how drastically they would affect the life of the village were unknowns. The anticipations were vague. "We know it is going to be a lot worse than we think it will be," one business man assured. "We had better get one good look at the old town as it is, because it never will be like this again," another asserted. Plans were talked over for meeting the expected crisis. Additional peace officers, serving on a fee basis, were sworn in and additional jail space was provided. It was realized that a sewerage system would be needed badly, but it was not until construction workers had seriously overtaxed the housing resources that a formal application for federal aid with which to construct such a system was filed; and not until after the construction work was virtually finished that its laying began. Spurred by the arrival of a few new merchants, the older ones put in some new store fronts; and a delegation from the town visited two other small cities near which similar camps had been built and talked with officials and business men as to the problems to be expected.

But, because of a lack of knowledge as to what to expect and an inability to make and execute plans for the coming crisis, little was actually accomplished. In part, too, this lack of preparation is traceable to the economic condition of the community. Funds were not available with which to form businesses which might be expected to profit during the boom. When persons came into the village and bought buildings or vacant lots on which to erect business buildings, the residents found themselves torn between emotions of pride at the expansion of their home town and envy that "outsiders" obviously were to reap any profits which might accrue through such enterprises. Merchants who were asked to lease their store buildings vacillated between the desires to cash in without risk through high rents and to retain control of their property and be in a position to take advantage of any opportunities which might present themselves. In some cases contracts were drawn in which the amount of rent was made contingent upon the coming of the camp or on the amount of business done. Early new businesses to appear in the town consisted of clothing stores, motion picture theaters, tourist camps, restaurants, and an enlargement to the post office. No preparation seems to have been made to provide additional housing other than the erection of two tourist camps and the staking out of trailer lots.

It was into this sort of a situation that workmen began pouring shortly after the turn of the year. That the term "pouring" accurately describes the process is indicated by the fact that by March 1 the United States Employment Service had received approximately 15,000 applications for work at this camp. Of this number approximately half were from migratory workers, though only about 150 were from outside the state of Texas. (Exact figures are not given because of the policy of the government in releasing information considered of military value.) In addition to the workers registering with the Employment Service, many others depended upon direct contacts with contractors or their friends who were already at work, to secure employment. The number of such workers is, of course, unknown but it is estimated to have been as high as one-fourth. Workers from out of the state during the early period came from Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana,

Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. The neighboring states supplied the greater numbers in this and subsequent counts. Whereas most of the local workers registering were unskilled, well over half of the migratory workers professed some skill.

During the months of February and March, the number of applicants for work at the camp rose to approximately 25,000 with skilled workers constituting about 55 per cent. As work progressed, the percentage of migrant workers increased. It was also observed that approximately three-fourths of the migrant workers came from areas in which construction of large war plants had been recently completed or were about to be completed. It is presumed that most such workmen had been employed in similar activities in these places. Interviews with workmen revealed that many of them had done no work other than that connected with the war effort for the last two years and that often such workers migrated in groups. By June 15 the construction work was approximately completed. Most of the workmen had left the area and applications taken by the United States Employment Service had dropped to little more than one hundred. Most of these were for places with the various "housekeeping" activities at the camp.

Obviously a village of less than 2,000 population was not equipped to house such an influx; nor to render the other services required of it. A small percentage of the workmen, the luckier ones, found rooms in the homes of the town or in the one small hotel. Many others brought their housing with them in the forms of tents or trailers. Still others, unable to find any sort of shelter, simply lived in their cars parked alongside the highways, sleeping on the ground in fair weather and on the back seat of the automobile when rains came. Some with no shelter simply slept in the open. One enterpriser secured a bit of ground near the entrance to the camp site, placed a sign "Beds on the Ground, 50c" and did a nice business.

When the construction boom began, one person asserted that there were not ten homes in the town in which roomers or boarders

were to be found. Late in the boom period this same person stated that there were not ten homes in which such temporary residents were *not* to be found. Men were commonly housed four to the room, two in each of two beds. In some instances the housewife prepared breakfast and dinner for the workmen at the home and a lunch to be taken with them to the job. One woman reported rising each morning at four o'clock to prepare lunches for the seventeen men boarding in her house. Not only were the ordinary sleeping quarters of the houses used for roomers, but living rooms, parlors, garages, woodsheds, even stables, were pressed into use. But even such crowding could not take care of the demand. In almost every yard in the town trailers were parked, electric connections being made with the house proper and bath and toilet facilities in the house being made available. Among the small children of the community a sort of a pride grew up in the number of trailers each child had in his own yard. The small daughter of the county judge complained bitterly because she had only four trailers in her yard, while some of the other children had as many as a dozen!

Other trailer camps were laid out and occupied to overflowing in the area across the highway from the entrances to the camp site. This area was several miles from the town proper and had been either in cultivation or covered with scrub forest growth before being turned into living space. Here the problems of water and sanitation were more acute. The common practice was to dig a well from which water was secured for all purposes. Community privies were provided; and the sanitary situation was considered taken care of. The soil in the area is light sand, and it seems highly probable that the fact that the construction period was over within about four months, and before the coming of hot weather, was the only reason epidemics of typhoid did not break out. The city authorities, backed by a two-county health unit, sought to mitigate this danger by requiring that all water for drinking purposes must be chlorinated. A thriving business grew up of selling such approved water at ten cents per ten-gallon can; but many of the workmen and their families preferred to go to the wells or even to a creek which ran nearby for their supply.

In addition to the established camps hundreds of tents and trailers parked along the banks of this creek or in other open spaces and lived as they saw fit, getting their water wherever they desired and disposing of their excreta without any thought of pollution of soil or stream. The same was true of those who parked their cars along the highway and slept on the ground. It was expected that local persons would relieve the housing shortage by construction of rental properties. But this was not done, the "natives" explaining that they did not know how acute the need would be nor could they be sure that houses built for temporary occupancy would be used long enough for them to be certain they would not lose money on the investment.

In addition to the workmen who lived in the village or near the camp, many commuted longer distances to their work. Most of the residents of Austin, thirty miles away, who worked on the construction retained their homes, usually making arrangements to go to and from the job in company with other workmen. The cost of such transportation amounted to from fifty cents to one dollar per day. Others lived at greater distances; a social worker told of a group of Negroes who travelled in a truck a distance of nearly 100 miles each way each day, taking about six hours to get to and from their work. These men often worked ten or twelve hours, so that their time at home for rest and sleep was sometimes no more than six hours.

The workmen who lived in trailers and tents often were accompanied by their wives, and sometimes by children. In many cases such women found friends they had made on other construction jobs and renewed the friendship. It was on this basis, mostly, that cliques formed in the trailer camps; though other elements were also noted. Women whose husbands worked for the same contractor seemed to be more friendly with each other; those whose cars or trailers were of about the same cost tended to form groups; and there seemed to be some tendency to identify persons and to make acquaintances on the basis of residence in the same camp. The usual criteria for making friends, as similarity of educational background, mutual friends, same or nearby place of residence, interest in the same expressional activities, seem not to have

operated to any appreciable extent. Indeed such criteria could not operate since the women had little opportunity to apply them under the conditions in which they were living, and in the face of the great heterogeneity of the camps.

Only crisis situations seemed to provoke any considerable community spirit. In several cases women complained to the management of camps of the presence of suspected prostitutes and succeeded in having the offenders ejected. In one camp a group of women became powerful enough that the manager was forced to eject a couple against whom no charges more specific than "they are not our sort" were lodged. Serious illness or injury brought manifestations of sympathy and offers of aid. But for the most part the contacts between the residents of camps were casual almost to the point of indifference.

The women in these camps have been described by one of the field workers as universally lonely; with no fixed schedule for the day; with contacts so casual that they more often than not did not know the names of other women with whom they visited. At the same time, this observer reports, the women were exceptionally cordial, serving refreshments to an unknown caller and issuing sincere invitations to stop in again when in the camp area. Drinking and fishing seemed to be the principal forms of recreation, though many also planted flowers or vegetables near their tents or trailers. Although the mothers who lived in camps were concerned over the school progress of their children, they did not attend meetings of parent-teacher organizations or school exercises. Neither did they attend church or Sunday school, though most of them asserted they did so when at home.

Here we would seem to have a picture of a group of people without community roots, living almost wholly in the present and feeling no attachment to any specific unit of the more general institutions which serve to control the activities of most of us and through which we satisfy our basic wants. This impression is heightened by the life histories of the migrant workers. One couple reported that Bastrop was the fourteenth town in which they had lived since their marriage, seven years before. In each

of these towns the wage earner had been engaged in construction work. A Vermont couple listed an even dozen defense jobs at which they had lived during the past two years. This, coupled with the tendency for the women to report that they had come to this job on the advice of friends, leads to the tentative conclusion that the defense effort created a group of workmen who have devoted their entire time to this sort of work, drifting from one job to the next; staying in no one town long enough to enable them to develop a sense of belonging; nor under conditions which would encourage such a feeling.

Although many of the workmen lived in the homes of "natives," few lasting or important contacts seem to have resulted. In the case of those workmen who lived in trailers or tents, even less interaction took place. This seems to have been true for several reasons. On the part of the workmen, they were in the town for a limited time only and knew this would be true before their arrival. Hence they saw little point in affiliating with churches, lodges, or even the local school. Their contacts were almost wholly commercial and casual. However, that they would have welcomed overtures on the part of permanent residents was evidenced by their appreciation of aid in securing quarters and similar services. During the presence of large numbers of workmen in the village, the postmaster estimated that as many as 5,000 persons asked for mail at the general delivery window during the day. Many of these persons, he said, did not expect, nor receive, mail, but asked merely to establish some sort of contact, even of such a fleeting and perfunctory nature.

On their part, the "natives" felt that these workers were disrupting their ordinary life routine and that they were incurring real dangers in allowing unknowns to enter their homes or schools or churches. Young people asserted they no longer felt at ease on the streets or in drug stores and that they would be quite frightened if they had to approach a stranger to ask aid in changing a tire. Attendance at local places of amusement by permanent residents dropped considerably, these places being used almost wholly by the workmen during the boom period. This also was true of the churches except in one case where the minister made

a strenuous effort to hold his regular congregation and to appeal to the newcomers. Incidentally, his efforts were rewarded by a large increase in contributions.

Women who lived in camp complained that the only times "native" women came to call were when they wished to see how "these poor people live" or when they solicited funds for USO or other community projects. One of the transient women complained, "All they want of us is what money they can get out of us." Recognition of something of the same attitude was expressed by a civic leader in the village who confessed that, "The trouble with the women of Bastrop is that they are drawing their skirts aside."

Because of these attitudes of mutual mistrust and lack of understanding, the permanent effects of the presence of the workmen appear not to be great. However, the women of the town who received boarders and roomers as a sincere patriotic duty, found themselves faced with new experiences which seem certain to change their attitudes. For the first time in the lives of many of them, they found themselves "in business" and with money which they had earned through their own efforts and which they might spend as they chose. Much of this fund, it appears, went into new furnishings for homes, many of which were selected with a view to pleasing prospective army tenants and on the basis of which higher rents might be charged.

Changed attitudes are more easy to observe in the business than in the "social" realm. Like the workmen, the new merchants came to the town to make money, to make it quickly, and then to leave when the boom was over. Their practices were coolly and nicely calculated to extract the largest profit in the shortest time and in the most painless manner. In this aim they had a distinct and often crucial advantage over their older competitors. Many of these men had operated stores in other war boom towns. One of these set up his stock of goods in a tent opposite the main entrance to the camp site where workmen would have the easiest possible access to him. These men knew what the workmen would want and what they were willing to pay for it. The older merchants knew neither of these things and also were seriously handicapped by stocks of old and agricultural merchandise which they were

anxious to be rid of and which they tried to persuade the workmen to buy. This was the sort of merchandise they were accustomed to handling and therefore the sort of merchandise they believed "normal" persons would want. Too, they were handicapped by their business ethic growing out of the long period of depression. They felt it ungentlemanly and unsportsmanlike to indulge in tactics which seemed only good business to their newer competitors. As a consequence they lost many sales. But worse, their old customers found their old cronies, the merchants, no longer able to gossip with them or to advise them as to purchases. Smarting under such treatment, they transferred their business to other less hectic communities and seemed in no hurry to return to Bastrop during June and July when the merchants would have been glad to see them.

The workmen bought only from day to day. They bought large quantities of ready cooked food but in amounts to serve one or two meals only. They bought items such as dust goggles only when dust storms blew. Even their tools they bought only as they began work demanding use of a particular tool. They bought few luxury items and only "cheap stuff." In contrast to this, the "natives" were in the habit of buying in larger quantities for longer periods of time and of anticipating their wants. This presented difficulties to the merchants. An index of the extent of the boom is contained in the statement of a dry goods merchant who reported that in 1941 his business for March and April amounted to \$2,500, while in 1942 he did approximately \$4,000 in sales each month.

Perhaps the practice which made most for poor relationships between the workmen and the commercial people of the town was that of charging ten or fifteen cents for cashing pay checks. The banks of the village imposed this charge on the grounds that they had been forced to borrow funds and hire extra clerks to handle this business. The merchants passed along the charge to the workmen. Although the workmen seldom complained about prices of merchandise, they complained most bitterly of this practice "on principle."

The more decorative character of life in Bastrop was abandoned by men and women alike during the construction boom period and it appears likely will not be resumed. Meetings of literary societies, fishing trips and golf games have been abandoned for the duration. The people of Bastrop have "more important things to do." The shift would seem to be in the direction of the secular and commercial and the depersonalization of contacts.

However, the older more primary and personal relationships have not disappeared. This could be shown no better than in the attitudes of the operator of the village "honky tonk," a place near the village in which beer is sold and a "juke box" provides music for dancing. The social structure of the village is nicely indicated by the fact that the woman who operates this place formerly was a teacher in the local school and appears to have maintained her status with very little if any impairment. Among her customers before the boom were former pupils and their parents. During the boom, these people almost entirely ceased to patronize her place, much to the sorrow of the ex-school teacher. Now she asserts she is very glad that the workmen have left although they were *not* a financial disappointment. "But I have always had to keep an eye on them. One of them even had the nerve to ask *me* to dance with him. That was absolutely the first time anything like that had happened to me and I told him what was what and asked him to leave and not to come back—ever." She also expressed a hope that the army would declare her place "out of bounds" so that she would not be bothered with soldiers and her friends might return as customers. The barber complained that the "boys" did not hang around any more, but added that if they did, he would have no time to swap yarns with them. Instead he put in a shower bath which was often used by man and wife, occasionally by an entire family.

The entire economy of both the village and county of Bastrop has been upset by the coming of the army camp. Something more than two hundred and fifty farm families were moved out of the military reservation. Some of these persons secured temporary work during the construction and located on other farms within the trading radius of the village. A considerable portion, however, left the area and moved to other portions of the state. Whether these farms will be replaced by others now seems uncer-

tain.

Other farmers, particularly tenants, left their farms for construction work. Whether they will return to local farms or go to other construction work is problematical. The presence of the camp will mean a very great increase in the number of persons needed in service occupations. The presence of large numbers of soldiers seems likely to prove a deterrent to the use of Bastrop as a trading and marketing center by farmers. On the other hand, the quartermaster corps has expressed encouragement to the farmers of central Texas to increase their production of food stuffs although the army will not buy directly from the farmer. All of these factors would seem to indicate the impossibility of a return to the sort of economic existence the town and county have known in the past. It seems literally true that economically, as socially, the old Bastrop is dead and a new Bastrop has been born.

On the basis of those areas of community life discussed, it seems that some tentative conclusions are warranted. It appears certain that a village of this sort cannot experience the sort of thing it has without making fundamental changes in its institutional arrangements and in its attitude-value structures. In general, this change seems to be toward the secular and commercial and away from the personal and primary. The institutions and the values both have proved themselves inadequate to the new situation and are in process of change. However, a reluctance to such change manifested itself even before the announcement that the camp would be built and has continued. It now finds expression in a nostalgia for the "good old quiet days." On the other hand, the citizens of the area are intensely proud of their close connection with the war effort and are seeking to take whatever advantage they may of the increased prosperity. The result is a two-way pull between loyalty to the Bastrop that was and pride in the Bastrop that is. When this conflict has been resolved, the period of readjustment may be said to be completed. This, of course, will not be accomplished until either an accommodation to the presence of a large body of troops has been made or peace has come and the camp has been abandoned or greatly reduced and still another period of readjustment has been accomplished. This is so far in the future that any attempt at prediction of its nature would be sheer folly.

## The Laissez-Faire State in Relation to the National Economy\*

CLEM C. LINNENBERG, JR.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

### II.

Senior and Stuart Mill agreed on the fundamental questions about aid to the needy. There should be government-supported relief, for both the "able-bodied" and the unemployables, given as of right. Aid to the "able-bodied" should be made considerably less attractive than ordinary employment. A corollary to this second principle was, they believed, that relief should not be on the Speenhamland plan, the system whereby, from 1795 to 1834, numerous English farm workers were assured a meager minimum income consisting of "outdoor" (i.e., non-institutional) relief or, for the employed, wages supplemented up to the same level by "outdoor" relief. James Mill and McCulloch initially opposed but later favored governmental support of relief.

Were there no poor relief, the classicists' argument ran in part, the fear of starvation would bring unhappiness to far more people than the few who would actually starve to death. *Assurance* of relief prevents this misery. Thus the basic principle of the classicists, the greatest-happiness principle, was invoked in order that the economic laws based on it might be ignored. But poor relief can be justified also in terms of economic science. Perhaps, said McCulloch, Mr. Canning exaggerated when he declared that the poor laws had saved the country from revolution. Nevertheless, ". . . there can be no manner of doubt that they have, on various occasions, preserved it from being a theatre of outrage, crime, and disorder." They give the poor an interest in public tranquillity. Also, workmen will be more efficient if they are secure. "Energy and self-dependence," said Stuart Mill, "are . . . liable to be impaired by the absence of help, as well as by its excess." Thus as in the case of the taken-for-granted functions of government,

\* This discussion, here concluded, was begun in the September issue, pp. 101-117.—Ed.

the state must intervene in order that the *laissez-faire* sector of endeavor can function properly.

McCulloch was not even certain that recipients of public relief are on charity. All property has been acquired with the knowledge that it is subject to this charge; so, perhaps, no particular individuals bear the burden. To Senior and Stuart Mill, relief should be made a matter of right in order that no pauper shall be at the mercy of an administrator and thus lack true security. Although Stuart Mill usually said, with McCulloch and Senior, that relief should be made unattractive, he did express some approval of the *droit au travail* and the *ateliers nationaux* of the French Provisional Government of 1848, with the qualifying remark that *all* guarantees of subsistence give an unfortunate stimulus to population so long as procreation is left to individual discretion. Ordinarily he agreed with Senior that workhouses are the proper means of affording relief. McCulloch, though he recognized that something must be done to discourage people from accepting relief, thought that workhouses were appropriate only for persons whose sloth, dissipation, and profligacy had made them need public support. For industrious persons having this need, "outdoor" relief should be provided. It is demoralizing to treat them the same as persons who have become paupers through their own fault.

Senior, on whose report the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 had been based, was of course an ardent defender of the scheme it set up. The 1834 legislation provided that, in general, relief in workhouses was to be substituted for "outdoor" relief to the "able-bodied," thus abolishing the Speenhamland system; and it provided for supervision of local relief authorities by national commissioners. The commissioners saw to it that the workhouses were very disagreeable. Stuart Mill's only complaint against the 1834 law was that Senior's recommendations had not been followed closely enough. To McCulloch the national supervision thus established was abominable. The Central Board's administration of the law was insufficiently adapted to particular circumstances, he said, and was a source of irritation. This is what any rational person would expect from a despotic organization—a group of persons given power over matters that are not their concern. "People of

property on the spot . . . are the only parties to whom the administration of workhouses, and of the public charity, can be safely intrusted." They know the situation thoroughly; and because they pay for the enterprise, their self-interest will insure "the judicious and economical treatment of the poor on their estates, and in their neighborhood." (Here he had forgotten his idea, expressed a few pages earlier, that perhaps no one in particular pays for relief.) The argument is the same as that for letting people run their own businesses; indeed, he clearly shared the opinion then common among propertied Britons that local government is essentially a private enterprise.<sup>1</sup>

McCulloch believed that the government should operate the post office. Inasmuch as he declared this to be the only branch of industry which should not be left to individual enterprise, it is instructive to consider the grounds on which he singled it out. Only government "can enforce perfect regularity in all its subordinate departments; . . . carry it to the smallest villages, and even beyond the frontier; and . . . combine all its separate parts into one uniform system, on which the public may rely for security and despatch." Moreover, revenue can be gotten from the post office. It is difficult to see that all of the first three items are peculiarly applicable to the post office. Nor is the fourth (but it is not stated to be so).

McCulloch approved of the existing but extensively violated law prohibiting what we call company stores. His reason was, of course, a recognition that interference was necessary to give the consumer liberty. Although he denounced in general the regulation of the quality of merchandise, he conceded that very peculiar products may perhaps be excepted from the let-alone principle. A man who buys a piece of bad cambric is not greatly harmed and will buy

<sup>1</sup> On poor relief, see James Mill, *Elements of Political Economy*, section on "Tithes and Poor Rates"; McCulloch, *Principles of Political Economy*, 1st edition (Edinburgh, William and Charles Tait, 1825), pp. 354-359; *Principles of Political Economy*, 5th edition, pp. 368-396; *On Commerce*, pp. 126-127; *Rate of Wages*, pp. 108-110; Senior, *Industrial Efficiency*, vol. ii, pp. 312-327; *Historical and Philosophical Essays*, vol. ii, chapter on "English Poor Laws"; Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 966-969; *Dissertations and Discussions* (London, John W. Parker and Son, 1859), vol. ii, pp. 384-388; *Letters*, vol. ii, p. 14.

elsewhere in the future. A man who buys a defective gun may lose his life as well as his money. The government should partly subsidize roads where the requisite funds cannot be gotten otherwise. It should prevent excessive charges by toll road, railway, canal, and water companies. He did not propose the granting of monopoly privileges to these companies but recognized that one of each set of competitors will have a *natural* advantage. Hence the need for control. Only one bank in the London area should have the privilege of note issue, for the pursuit of self-interest on the part of competing banks would result in the depression of the exchange, the injury of the country's credit, and the throwing of commercial transactions into "inextricable confusion." "Freedom is valuable only as a means to an end . . .," viz., the public advantage. Here another means is better. But the Bank of England is preferable to a government-owned bank, for the latter would not be as efficient and honest, he asserted.

As has been noted, Stuart Mill believed that the government should intervene to insure the quality of a commodity if the consumer's judgment is not an adequate protection. In his *Political Economy* Mill specified no commodity, save education, with respect to which such protection is necessary. But he said that even as regards material objects, of which in general the consumer is able to judge properly, there are some the quality of which must be insured by the government. The state, he felt, thus gives effect to the individual's wishes.

To Stuart Mill the vast business enterprises of the sort which some "libertarians" of our time seek to protect from state interference were quite different from individuals. Where ownership and control are almost entirely separated, he remarked, the managers are affected by their self-interest *qua* shareholders in the same insignificant manner as public officials are affected by their self-interest *qua* taxpayers. Shareholders of big joint-stock companies, he stated, have very little actual control over the managers. (Berle and Means take note;) Citizens, through public discussion, have a greater degree of control over state officials. "The defects, therefore, of government management do not seem to be necessarily much greater, if necessarily greater at all, than those of

management by joint-stock," as far as regards honesty and efficiency. Furthermore, he said, there are many companies (including public utilities) among which *laissez faire* does not produce free competition.

The "monopolies" section of this *Political Economy* deals with, and damns, governmentally granted monopolies. What the word "monopoly" calls to our minds was discussed by him under the heading of situations requiring a departure from *laissez faire*. In his day *de facto*, extra-legal or illegal monopolies did not cover nearly so large a sector of economy as they do in our time. In manufacturing, there was much ampler ground than now for the view then prevalent in the classical school that even though self-interest may cause business men to combine, self-interest will likewise cause them to break their agreements. Senior was perhaps the most ardent advocate of this opinion. Stuart Mill alone lacked dogmatic faith in it. "Where competitors are . . . [very] few," he said, "they always agree not to compete. They may run a race of cheapness to ruin a new candidate, but as soon as he has established his footing they come to terms with him."

Certainly in public utilities this was what had been happening. Among railways, for example, the tremendous amalgamating movement in the second quarter of the century called public attention to the fact that *laissez faire*'s promises to the consumer could in this instance be executed only by interference. In 1854 Parliament sought by the Canal and Railway Traffic Regulation Act, to eliminate discrimination and insure to every one access to reasonable facilities. The machinery of enforcement was proceedings in equity. By 1872 the inevitable ineffectiveness of this scheme was described in the report of a Select Committee on Railway Companies Amalgamation. In the following year the Railway Commission was created, with a rate-control function.

Meantime, what was Stuart Mill saying should be done? The state, he wrote as early as 1848, should not undertake to *manage* the enterprises which were now managed by companies (i.e., by "big business"). Such a practice would make the state too powerful and diminish individual initiative. But the state ought to

control the prices charged by the companies wherever competition does not exist. He suggested that, in such a control scheme for railways and canals, the state might own and lease the property. Granted that the economic benefits promised by the let-alone school are the ones for which we should strive, Mill's ideas on monopoly were far sounder than either the dogma of *laissez faire* or the intervention of 1854.<sup>2</sup>

For child labor, Stuart Mill favored the half-time system. Senior had somewhat similar views. The position of each was linked to the reforms in education which they favored. In 1863, a government commission reporting on child labor in industries which were not yet regulated described such horrors as the working of six-year-old children from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., and work space of less than twenty-five cubic feet per child. Here, as in the matter of education, Senior and Stuart Mill pointed out that children, in the absence of state interference, are subject to parental interference; and a tremendous number of parents interfere in their own interest instead of the children's. "Freedom of contract, in the case of children," said Mill, "is but another word for freedom of coercion." As was usual in the classical writings, the argument of Mill and Senior ran in terms of the behavior of individuals. It is not a bad social situation that makes it necessary for the government to do something; it is the selfishness of parents.

In principle, Senior approved of statutory limitation of the labor of children 9 to 13 years of age in textile mills to 6 or 8 hours per day. But he objected to administrative procedures essential to adequate enforcement. Moreover, he opposed the agitation which led to the 1847 law reducing the maximum work week for "young persons" (13 to 18 years of age) employed in textile mills, from 69 hours to 58. He vigorously insisted that, for "the cotton manu-

<sup>2</sup> On monopoly, government ownership, and regulation of prices and quality, see McCulloch, *Principles of Political Economy*, 5th edition, pp. 217-223; *Treatises and Essays*, p. 487; *Historical Sketch of the Bank of England* (London, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1831); *passim*; Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 953-963; Hermann Levy, *Monopoly and Competition* (London, MacMillan and Company, Ltd., 1911), pp. 100-101; Richard T. Ely, "Senior's Theory of Monopoly," *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 3rd series, vol. 1, (1900), no 1, pp. 89-102.

facture," a reduction below the existing maximum of 11½ hours per day would bring dire consequences. One hour of operation out of the 11½ was necessary for the earning of the usual rate of profit (10%, including 5% interest). A half hour was necessary to secure remuneration for depreciation and obsolescence. Any reduction would either "destroy profit,"<sup>3</sup> or reduce wages to the Irish standard, or raise the price of the commodity, by an amount which it is not easy for me to estimate." The price rise of 16% which the principal fine spinners estimated would result from a ten-hour day would reduce home consumption and keep Britain out of the foreign market, which was consuming three-fourths of the British output. Also, the unavoidable inference from reading Senior's letter on this subject along with his discussion of profit in his *Political Economy* is that a reduction of the rate of profit would result in a slowing down of accumulation.

Both Senior and Stuart Mill keenly opposed the application of maximum-hours legislation to women (16 years being the age at which Senior believed each sex should cease to be thus protected). These writers viewed such protection as contrary to the women's real interest. Women, said Senior, have as clear a perception of their own interest as men have, and they have as much determination and power to follow it. Mill believed that potentially they have these qualities; if they were not subjected to male tyranny the qualities would be manifest. Remove that tyranny and they will not need the Factory Act protection which, since 1844, they have been receiving. Such protection, both men declared, puts women on the footing of children<sup>4</sup>

Stuart Mill and Senior were both staunch advocates of the Wakefield system. Unregulated emigration had not taken off a sufficient number of people and was unsatisfactory otherwise. Wakefield proposed that land in the colonies be regarded as government property. It should be sold, and the proceeds used to remove from

<sup>3</sup> This would not happen, on the basis of his calculations, unless the reduction were as great as one hour.

<sup>4</sup> On regulation of the labor of women and children, see Senior, *Industrial Efficiency*, vol. ii, pp. 305-311 and 340-353; *Letters on the Factory Act, passim*; Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 956-959; *Letters*, vol. ii, pp. 255-256.

the mother country young men and women in equal numbers as voluntary colonists. In effect the government would be capitalizing the advantage the new countries had over the old one with respect to what Ricardo termed the "original and indestructible powers of the soil." The Wakefield principle actually came to be used in some of the British colonies (e.g., New Zealand) with, so Mill and Senior declared, fabulously good results.

In the treating of the mother country's social ills of unemployment and low wages, emigration appeared to these two writers to be, by itself, a palliative rather than a cure. Senior added that emigration is necessary, as a preliminary, to permit the success of any more permanent remedy. He wrote at some length on the value of emigration as a stimulus to economic activity in the old and new countries. Stuart Mill, as usual, had a broader view. "The question of government intervention in Colonization involves the future and permanent interests of civilization itself, and far outstretches the comparatively narrow limits of purely economical considerations." As for the latter sort of considerations—he believed the problem to be not only one of distribution (of laborers) but also one of production, producing goods where they can be produced most cheaply.

Senior believed that nationalities other than the Britist and the Germans no longer had a disposition to migrate spontaneously. On two other reasons why *laissez faire* is inadequate in colonization, he and Stuart Mill were united. The expense of emigration keeps down the volume, free land induces the few colonists to scatter on small homesteads, and this dispersion inhibits moral and intellectual cultivation. Secondly, because so many people become landowners there are not enough wage laborers to insure the division and combination of labor essential to greatest efficiency. Laborers for hire, said Mill, are "in every country . . . a most important auxiliary even to peasant proprietors."

In Stuart Mill's opinion, the Wakefield scheme aided the colonists to effectuate their own desires. A colonial hired workman who, under a *laissez-faire* scheme of settlement, quits his job and acquires land is only wanting to do well financially. It is not this

particular line of action that appeals to him. But it is the best expedient under the circumstance prevailing, viz., competitive grabbing of free land. If he must work for wages until he has acquired capital to buy land, his land when acquired will be worth more than it would be under *laissez faire*, by virtue of the availability of laborers for hire.<sup>5</sup>

On the question of socialism<sup>6</sup> Senior and Stuart Mill, who were united on sundry issues of reform, furnish an interesting contrast. To Senior socialism was a theory that the government (an entity quite apart from the people subject to it) owes every one a living. His diatribe against the French Revolution of 1848 and against the *ateliers nationaux* was fierce. He said that as long as the poor believe that socialism will make every one well off they must be restrained from voting. The poor in France, he asserted about 1849, had been spoiled by having the vote for a time; hence the only hope for France was to stem the tide of socialism by means of a standing army having little sympathy with the people, and no vote. Voting, he felt, reminds a soldier that he is a proletarian. Here, as in so many other connections, Senior showed quite plainly his utter lack of respect for the laborers; they are instruments of production, and should be looked after kindly and kept properly disciplined like mules.

Stuart Mill looked with favor on certain thoroughgoing social changes and with tolerance on others which would have been emphatic departures from the highly stratified capitalistic society which his fellow classicists—particularly Senior—thought to be, basically, the most perfect order conceivable. He regarded peasant proprietorship as vastly preferable to the economic pattern then most prevalent in England's agriculture. Peasant proprietors, he declared, are more industrious than wage laborers because peasant proprietors are certain that *they* will get the benefit from any unusual zeal they possess. Because they are secure from physical

<sup>5</sup> On colonization, see Senior, *Industrial Efficiency*, vol. 1, pp. 338-357; *Rate of Wages*, preface; Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 969-975.

<sup>6</sup> The socialism and communism with which Senior and Mill were acquainted were the sort which is described as "utopian" rather than the type termed "scientific." The *ateliers nationaux* followed a revolution, but even they did not belong to so-called "scientific" socialism.

want and because they have the responsibilities of ownership, they are more intelligent, more prudent, more temperate, better self-controlled. One of the most fortunate consequences accruing from these virtues is the reduction in the birth-rate. In the writings of his mature years, Stuart Mill was a Malthusian, looking to "moral restraint" as a check on population, even though, as a young man, he had advocated neo-Malthusianism—birth control.)

But peasant proprietorship was desired only as an intermediate step to more thorough change. Stuart Mill's father taught him to believe in the justice and practicality of a tax to absorb all unearned increment in the value of land. Until this reform could be effected, the younger Mill declared, a wide diffusion of land ownership could of course help decrease the net result of private receipt of rent. Another idea he felt to be more advanced than peasant proprietorship was co-operation, of owners and employees or (preferably and eventually) of workmen alone. This he thought of as applicable not only to agriculture but to other economic activity also. The benefits would be the same as those accruing from peasant proprietorship, plus the greater efficiency of large scale production. His esteem for peasant proprietorship and producers' co-operation came from observation of them on the Continent.

How will these progressive changes be effected? The limitation of the amount a person may inherit, he said, will contribute. And the government should encourage voluntary associations by such means as freeing them of certain legal restrictions. The growth of knowledge, increasing altruism, increasing ability to esteem ideals above immediate gain are the forces on which Stuart Mill relied chiefly. Thus the state's influence for progress is significant, but indirect and not all-inclusive. "The prospect of the future depends on the degree in which . . . [the laborers] can be made rational human beings." This process is going on, he believed, very slowly but certainly. The slowness of this evolution is, in any country, inevitable; man is dominated by habit and custom. Mill said that Englishmen are selfish while they proudly call their selfishness "practicality." But like the Saint-Simonians from whom he took some of his ideas, he had hope—hope more a consequence of desire, perhaps, than of observation.

Unlike his fellow classicists he insisted that the laws of distribution are, in sharp contrast to the laws of production, subject to the will of man. Mill was able to observe existing social phenomena without concluding that none different could exist. He maintained that free competition is always a necessity to the proper functioning of society. Yet he said of *laissez faire* as early as 1883, ". . . that principle, like other negative ones, has work to do yet, work namely of a destroying kind, and I am glad to think it has strength left to finish that, after which it must soon expire; peace be with its ashes when it does expire, for I doubt much if it will reach the resurrection." He believed that mankind's selfishness would prevent communism or socialism from functioning properly at present, but that some day enough progress toward altruism might be made that one of those systems would be practicable. The communism and socialism of which he wrote had a great similarity to American collectivistic experiments of the nineteenth century and differed markedly from the regime of the twentieth-century Soviet Union. Although he expressed fear that communism or socialism would suppress the free intellectual and emotional development of the individual, in so doing he explicitly was not defending the then existing status of society. He regarded "the condition of the majority of the human race" in his time as abominable. For the present the political economist's chief aim should be "not the subversion of the system of individual property, but the improvement of it, and the full participation of every member of the community in its benefits." The creed of Stuart Mill was economic democracy.<sup>7</sup>

An estimate of the ideas of McCulloch, Senior, and the Mills on the relation of the state to the economy must take into account the contrast between Stuart Mill and the earlier three men. The ideas of these three are characterized by a myopic effort at expounding

<sup>7</sup> On the refashioning of society, see Senior, *Industrial Efficiency*, vol. II, pp. 291-300; Stuart Mill, *Letters*, vol. I, pp. 46, 172-173; vol. II, pp. 387-395; *Principles of Political Economy*, pp. 201-211, 217, 256-301, 757, 764-792; *Dissertations and Discussions*, vol. II, pp. 398, 403; *Representative Government* (London, Parker, Son, and Bourn, 1861), p. 55; "Socialism" and "Utilitarianism" (Chicago, Belfords, Clarke, and Company, 1879; Norman E. Himes, "The Place of John Stuart Mill and of Robert Owen in the History of English Neo-Malthusianism," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. xlii, p. 627.

immutable truth. They strove to show how utility may be promoted; and yet their thinking ran in terms of absolutes and was none too perceptive. For them the basic, ultimate fact is the human atom; and therefore government—conceived as a factor quite apart from the assortment of individuals—is essentially bad. Thus the use of the words "interference" and "intervention" is highly significant. In the behavior of individuals, a salutary resultant is derived from a conflict of numerous forces each of which is distasteful when considered separately but highly praiseworthy when considered functionally. Somehow this logic is not applied to the mutually conflicting forces involved in government.

The basic, ultimate truth for them is that the human atom should be made as happy as possible. But constant reaffirmation of this and of the corollary that the general function of the state should be to further human happiness did not prevent them from holding—with far stronger conviction—the above-mentioned conception of government. Nor did reiteration of another corollary of the happiness principle, viz., that property rights are inferior to considerations of utility, prevent them from believing, in regard to the laws of distribution, that the mores are indefeasible destiny. Furthermore, the happiness principle itself might conceivably have prevented, but did not prevent, them from glorifying *laissez faire* for its own sake.

In their opinion of the state, they were influenced doubtless by their observation of what the creature actually was. For this, if one seeks to be empirical one cannot cast stones. It was as late as 1855 that an order in council was issued which laid the foundations of what became a merit system for the home civil service. John Bright's characterization of the civil service of his time as "the outdoor relief department of the British aristocracy" was tragically apt. From that, of course, it does not follow that nepotism in public life was more pervasive than that nepotism outside the government which Jane Austen so quietly took for granted.

The inclination to apotheosize the prevailing distribution scheme and the principle of *laissez faire* had a less adequate basis. In the manufacturing sector of the economy that situation prevailed which Carlyle damned as the "cash nexus," in which values other than

the material welfare of one's self had little encouragement. The leaders of the manufacturing sector, who made a noise out of proportion to their number and who revered the pound, were a highly impressive sociological phenomenon. It took a more philosophic economist than James Mill, or McCulloch, or Senior to avoid being impressed. Like many of our contemporaries, these three had the preconception that whatever promotes the profits of any part of the business community is good for the nation at large. This verity made it possible (though perhaps a bit inappropriate) to apply to the miserable industrial workmen a logic of how-material-welfare-is-furthered which was most decidedly applicable to the leading industrial employers. Industrial England was booming; and, even before it went in for freedom of international trade, it had been far in the lead of the rest of the world in degree of industrial development. In this situation, freedom of international trade and of internal trade was quite profitable. Though Manchester's slums festered, business thrived. In defense of these three economists, however, it must be added that much of the "restrictive system" which they had in mind could be shown factually to have been to the disadvantage of the laborers. They were thinking, in part, of such restraints-on-freedom as the old apprenticeship regulations, a bogey of the then recent past.

Except that Stuart Mill believed the laws of distribution were socially determined, he reaffirmed the economic gospel of these three insofar as it was a body of value and distribution theory. As noted above, he also shared in modified form their conception of society. It was in consequence of these two facts that he agreed with them to a great extent concerning immediate aspects of the problem of the state's relation to the economy. But even when he favored the same measures as they, his argument lacked that dogmatic quality which theirs possessed. To avoid dogmatism, a thinker need not lack conviction. He needs merely to perceive and admit the implications of his creed. Stuart Mill was able to do this by dint of the breadth of vision he possessed in the matter of values. Man was to him an atom, but one so subtle that we must not be superficial in devising ways for it to secure happiness. This atom is the basic, ultimate fact, but the atom's inexhaustible qualities—which the other classicists also apparently believed to exist

—necessitate that in promoting its happiness we never regard as absolutely and eternally effective any means we have adopted toward that end. We must undeviatingly pursue the goal of human happiness. Stuart Mill was not a relativist; but unlike his fellow classicists he caused his habit of thinking in terms of absolutes to be a vital thing by sticking to one absolute, happiness, rather than unknowingly collecting additional ones, such as particular institutions and customs.

The key word in his glorification of human happiness is liberty. Like all other creative ideas his conception of liberty is exceedingly flexible. "Liberty," which to his fellows was essentially synonymous with a negative ideal of "let-alone," was to him at times a blanket term for devices promotive of human welfare, and never less than a symbol of individual dignity. His father, McCulloch, and Senior extolled liberty in the sense in which they conceived of it. But the liberty of which Stuart Mill was so passionate a defender was the opportunity for man to utilize his own known or as yet unexplored possibilities for enjoyment. Stuart Mill defended liberty more ardently than they did because he never ceased to regard it as the all-embracing means of attaining the highest good and because he never ceased to love mankind as deeply as did Walt Whitman.

On casual inspection his advocacy of associations might seem incompatible with his atomistic outlook. But the associations he advocated were voluntary and deliberate, and therefore were summations of individuals. Moreover, he believed that men are gradually becoming less egoistic and less materialistic. If individuals are given the opportunity to continue to develop the qualities which make for greater enjoyment, he said, they will co-operate more and more. But association can and must be of a sort that will promote, not impede, human welfare. Here, as always, liberty was the divine spark which illumined his thought. It is significant in this connection that, even though he used his school's word "intervention" to apply to governmental activity, his use of it was free of most of the implication which is so plainly discernible in their employment of it. "Government" was to him not antithetical to "man" but an association of men.

We learn from the writings of James Mill, of McCulloch, of Senior on the state's relation to the economy that even in their *milieu*, less complex than ours and even fettered by their dogmatism, they found it necessary sometimes to explain that economic laws do not call for the same remedies for all problems. From Stuart Mill's writings we learn that he never had any doubts as to which ought to be master—man or tradition.

The classicists' ideas on the relation of the state to the economy can also be appraised in terms more closely linked to types of problem immediately confronting us. For example, the idea of Senior and Stuart Mill that relief should be given as of right merits emphasis even though it cannot be considered independently of their view that the obnoxious environment of the workhouse is, for the "able-abodied," a necessary check upon abuse of this right. In our day, the social insurances involve payment of benefits as of right, and there are some public assistance systems for unemployables (e.g., the non-contributory old-age pension system of Britain) which provide that each person meeting certain rather objective criteria of need shall receive aid. Nevertheless, there are large sectors of contemporary public aid, such as American general relief and the WPA program, which have never adopted the principle of providing assistance as of right. In addition, it is characteristic of American general relief and was characteristic of the WPA to possess at any one time a "back-log" of certified cases of genuine need, beyond the number for which available funds could provide. In a sense, our principles and our practice in social security are less liberal than the views of Senior and Stuart Mill.

McCulloch's attempt at distinguishing the post office from enterprises which should *not* be operated by the government was no more fumbling than any analogous efforts of our contemporaries. There are American communities today which take it for granted that the water department, along with the fire department, is municipal, but which, when faced with a proposal that electricity be provided by a governmental body, are torn asunder by considerations unrelated to the cost and quality of service. Confusion as to the province of government is equally evident on the part of people who balk at the idea of uniform governmental compulsion to buy

war bonds, preferring to leave the motivation, in such purchases, up to the individual and his employer. They concede that the exercise of governmental authority contributes to adequacy and equity in military recruitment. But the type of governmental action most needed to brake inflation—a heavy reduction in civilian purchasing power—is, up till November 1943, too frightful even to be seriously considered. Hence considerations of adequacy and equity are largely ignored.

Our newspapers furnish us fresh evidence each day that, in our time as in that of the classical school, a contrast between the "proper spheres" of governmental and of non-governmental action can be emphasized so much as to obscure some more practical considerations. Note a recent open letter from President William B. Craig of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, Inc., to Henry A. Wallace, then chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare. Mr. Craig was alarmed at the possibility that, after the reaching of an armistice, the BEW would, through government offices, dispose of its stocks of commodities. ". . . If the United States," he said, "desirous of feeding broken Nations after the war, finds it necessary to make financial loans to them so that they may buy sugar, coffee, wheat, clothing, etc., even though our Government owns such merchandise it should be handled by those established enterprises here and abroad normally marketing such goods, making available their experienced services and organizations at reasonable cost."<sup>8</sup> He urged the use of "normal channels of trade, here and abroad," as the proper alternative to distribution by the United States government. In a letter filled with pleas for "the American economic way of life," it is curious to find the same solicitude indiscriminately applied to private business everywhere. Can Mr. Craig believe that the post-war preservation of "normal channels of trade" in Germany is a desirable aim, even though German business has been Nazified along with German government and the two are intertwined?<sup>9</sup> Can he believe that French and Norwegian "normal channels of trade," when hostilities shall have ceased, will necessarily be in line with the most beneficent traditions of

<sup>8</sup> *Washington Post*, March 16, 1943, p. 15.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Sidney Merlin, "Trends in German Economic Control Since 1933," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February 1943, pp. 169-207.

France and Norway? Mr. Craig's apparent anxiety over the possibility of extensive dumping by the American government merits attention; but it is more difficult to comprehend a blanket choice of business organization everywhere in preference to agencies of the United States government. We will be rendering a fantastic disservice to the next generation of Americans and to the present and future generations in the countries which are now Nazi-controlled if we assume that a change of government, without fundamental economic and social change, will extirpate the forces that make for organized brutality, robbery, and enslavement. Fritz Thyssen may have abandoned the views which caused him to help finance Hitlerism, but it is too much to expect that all of his counterparts have done so. It would be even more optimistic to hope for similar renunciation and repentance by the newly successful persons, in government or out, in Germany or elsewhere, whose eminence is the gift of Hitlerism. If we are to build a decent and comfortable world, we must remember that neither the state nor private enterprise is sacrosanct.

A recent Congressional investigation has shown both (a) the peril of a dualism which would judge the social usefulness of government and business on separate bases, and (b) the increasing unwisdom of any assumption that the distributive shares (e.g., profit) will each find a socially satisfactory level if left alone. According to evidence presented last March to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Investigating Committee, numerous privately owned American merchant vessels, chartered to the British Ministry of War Transport in 1941 to carry war supplies to the Red Sea, realized on each trip a profit per vessel amounting to several times the vessel's book value. Payment for the outbound voyage was from United States Lend-Lease funds. The U. S. Maritime Commission ". . . was in the position of approving the . . . rates, although without legal power at the time to force a reduction."<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Prior to the Congressional inquiry, which first gave publicity to the profits from these voyages, the Maritime Commission asked the nineteen companies involved to return some of the profits voluntarily. By May 1943 one concern had refunded about half of the "total profit stated by the company" to have been received for its share of the voyages; and one other company had indicated "its willingness to comply with suggested adjustments." *New York Times*, March 24, 1943, p. 22; March 25, 1943, p. 22; May 8, 1943, p. 3; and the above Committee's Document No. 7, "Memoranda on Voyages to the Red Sea under Space Charters to the British Ministry of War Transport," March 23, 1943.

It is difficult to say where the greater responsibility lay—whether in the steamship companies, for thus cashing in on an alluring supply-and-demand situation, in which a *de facto* ally of ours had her back to the wall, or in the Maritime Commission, for not having exposed the performance to the sort of public indignation which greets every demand of organized labor for a wage increase.

Like Stuart Mill, the present writer perceives no more precise formula for determining the proper boundary between government and non-government than the suitability of any given institution or procedure, governmental or non-governmental, to specified objectives sought or permitted by society. The fitting of means to ends is no easy task. Moreover, their reciprocal function should be recognized. If cheap, abundant electricity in the Tennessee Valley brings substantial industrialization there, the industrialized inhabitants will, for good or ill, doubtless develop new goals. A means can produce new ends.

In principle, at least, Senior shared Stuart Mill's idea as to how to determine the proper limits of government. If, for the want of a better, this is the criterion for determining in any given instance whether we shall use the state as a means or use something else, it nevertheless does not tell us how to decide upon ends, to the extent that ends are fashioned by conscious choice. The basic social goal in Benthamism, the greatest happiness of the greatest number, is ill-defined mathematics and makeshift social science. But, among American social scientists in 1943, it probably has more adherents than any other social objective, despite that abounding species of "realism" (assuredly not the only sort of "realism") which consists of lip-smacking about the shabby quality of mankind's behavior, coupled with indifference as to whether that behavior will or can change.

Perhaps the reason why the classicists found the Benthamite principle an adequate statement of objectives is that they did not live in a world undergoing a cataclysm. We know that tomorrow has a large chance of being incomparably worse or incomparably better than today. Despite the iniquitous political persecutions in

early nineteenth-century Britain, despite the rosy hopes of the Continental forty-eighters, despite all the other ups and downs of soul and circumstance which time obscures, there is a contrast on this score between the period of classical economics and our own period. In a sense this makes our own process of determining goals a simpler one than that of the Mills, McCulloch, and Senior. Unless a preponderant part of the present-day world proceeds to act upon an assumption that the most elementary and most urgent social objectives which are desirable are dignity, nutrition, and security of person, an early generation will see the beginning of a long eclipse of all popular opportunity to determine any social objectives. The political and economic horse sense called "globalloney" in some quarters needs to be accepted by enough people that the rest of the world will have to accept it, willy-nilly, as the ground-work for putting an end to chaos-as-usual.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Sources for this paper which are not cited above include McCulloch, *Letters of John Ramsay McCulloch to David Ricardo, 1818-1823* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1931); Senior, *Political Economy* (London, John Joseph Griffin and Company, 1850); Stuart Mill, *Autobiography* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1924).

## Book Reviews

EDITED BY O. DOUGLAS WEEKS

*The University of Texas*

Cochran, Thomas C. and Miller, William, *The Age of Enterprise*. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. pp. x, 394.)

Cochran and Miller's *Age of Enterprise*, subtitled "A Social History of Industrial America," has received to date almost uniformly enthusiastic treatment at the hands of its reviewers. Its importance as a social treatise, as a new and significant interpretation of American history, has been so greatly emphasized that it has been with a feeling of some disappointment that this reviewer has completed his reading of the book. As regards the novelty and significance of their approach, the authors themselves, although making no claim to original research, manifest (not without appropriate modesty) something of the enthusiasm which has been evidenced by the reviewers. They state in their preface that "*The Age of Enterprise* is a new interpretation of the history of the United States . . ." and they regard themselves as entering upon a hitherto "unexplored field in American history." Their venture, as they indicate, represents an effort to relate "the story of business enterprise itself, the story of its institutions and their impact upon American society." It is an attempt "to chart the course of our history from a business point of view." It seems to me that theirs is not so much an interpretation of the course of American economic development in terms of business enterprise as it is an interpretation of business enterprise in terms of American economic development. The tremendous advance in technology which has characterized the modern period of history (and, in truth, shaped it) afforded an effective incentive to population increase at the same time that it threw open a new continent to settlement. Technological progress and the settlement of America went hand in hand. The individual business man, himself in part a product of the advancing technology (and in part responsible for it) found a succession of opportunities both for gaining wealth and seizing power perhaps unequalled in the history of the world. As an expanding technology made possible an increasing population and created opportunities for the business man, it likewise gave rise to a new philosophy and a new political program. The theory and practice of mercantilism were superseded by the philosophy of economic liberalism and a political program of *laissez-faire*. It was under the influence of these spiritual and physical forces that America developed. The business man occupied the center of the stage.

It is the role which the business man played in the gaining of wealth and the seizing of power and in influencing political action in his own interest as the American economy unfolded that Cochran and Miller are

primarily interested in. This role they trace in an interesting and discerning manner from the advent of the Republic to the New Deal. While at the outset commercial activities afforded the best business opportunities, the War of 1812, and the disturbances to commerce which preceded it, gave manufacturing a foothold; broadening domestic markets, increase in population, improvements in transportation and the settlement of the West completed the foundations for an industrial society under the leadership of the business man.

For several decades a degree of economic unity among the several political sections of the country persisted, the West producing much of the Nation's food, the South its cotton for Northern and English factories, and the North supplying manufactures and transportation facilities for every corner of the land. The North, the source of funds for the construction of factories, railroads and canals and for mortgaging of farm and plantation, gathered in most of the profits. The South, jealous of Northern affluence and fearful of its loss of political supremacy, decided upon secession. Business men of the North, although not enthusiastic for war, exploited it in a businesslike manner and took advantage of the outcome, through their control of Congress, to secure legislation favorable to business aims. Intrenched in the industrial world and triumphant in politics, the business man embraced the Spencerian philosophy of *laissez-faire* and economic individualism and utilized it as a rationale to destroy free markets and intrench monopoly. While "free competition became the keystone of the triumphal arch of American business philosophy," monopolistic trends ran on apace. The history of the period since the Civil War, as recorded by the authors, runs largely in terms of the decline of competition and the rise and climax of finance capitalism, the disappearance of individualism and the development of corporate monopolies.

With the frontiers gone, with investment opportunities limited, with monopoly more concerned in protecting invested capital than in expanding it, with individualism relegated to the realm of folklore, assumption by the government of responsibility for making the economic system work was almost inevitable. "Apparently private enterprise was no longer able by itself to supply enough new jobs for the growing American population, no longer able to distribute the national income so that all the Americans could have at least food, clothing, and shelter. . . . Therefore, the government under the New Deal undertook in some areas to supplement private enterprise." Although the New Deal was interested in the inauguration of reforms for the improvement of American society, "More important than any reform measures was the assumption by the New Deal government of many functions heretofore performed almost exclusively by private enterprise."

"What the result of this new trend in American social relations will be, no one dares foretell." But the authors are not pessimistic. "The 'union of business and government' . . . may yet result in even greater opportunities, greater freedom, greater wealth for the multitude than did the hustling, optimistic economy based exclusively upon private initiative."

Although the above summary by reason of its sketchy character necessarily fails to do the authors' interpretation justice, it should reveal to any reader of the current press that their interpretation is not entirely new. It is unique, perhaps, in its sustained emphasis, in its selection of illustrative material, in its synthesis. This may be both a virtue and a shortcoming. As a social history of industrial America drawn from a wide variety of secondary sources, it is fragmentary, eclectic, and in this reviewer's opinion, somewhat superficial. Nevertheless, it affords a popular, readable account of the role of business enterprise as American economic development has unfolded.

The University of Texas

GEORGE W. STOCKING

Macdonald, Austin F., *Government of the Argentine Republic*. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, pp. xii, 476.)

The completeness of this book makes it particularly valuable for any student of present-day Argentina from a politico-administrative viewpoint. Not even in Argentina itself can such a thorough and impartial treatment on the complicated machinery of the government of that country be found. There are, indeed, hundreds of excellent monographs on the various aspects of the political life of Argentina; but Professor Macdonald's work is the first to embrace them all in a well unified and vivid whole.

The first four chapters ("The Land and the People," "The Colonial Era," "Independence and Dictatorship," and "Government under Constitution") are only introductory in character—a rapid survey of the formative period of the modern country of today. The reader has to go as far as Chapter Five to be actually initiated in the intricacies of the functional working of Argentine development. The novelty of the book as a comprehensive review and a sagacious interpretation lies in the pages that follow Chapter Five. From the academic angle, both professor and student should be grateful to Professor Macdonald for such a clear contribution, which sets an example that might well be imitated by other scholars with regard to other Latin-American countries.

In the purely political field, Argentina is a typical illustration of the fact that democracy can only be attained through a social attitude rather

than through any theoretical willingness. Argentina strove more than any other Latin-American republic—and with better possibilities—to establish a genuine liberal democracy. From Alberdi, Sarmiento and Mitre down to Sáenz Peña and Yrigoyen, its political leadership was made up of illustrious men who sincerely believed in democracy. They reformed public education; they converted into realities the fundamental democratic principles of free-speech, free-commerce, and free-religion; they threw the doors of the country open to European immigration; they called in foreign investments; they lavished concession to foreign capital; they did, in short, everything they could with no other view than to enroot democracy in the land. Argentina, through the action of all the above factors combined, achieved remarkable progress, economically and culturally speaking; it almost achieved world-powerhood in less than fifty years; but it did not achieve political democracy. From the time of the overthrow of Rosas (1852), the last representative of the revival of the old colonial order, down to Sáenz Peña, Argentine politics was manipulated by an oligarchy embodied in the Conservative Party. Yrigoyen was the first president to be elected in free elections, but, again, instead of trying to perfect the democratic machinery which at last was permitted to be mounted, he squandered his huge political capital in maladministration—with a strong bent toward demagoguery. The unfortunate result was that his second administration became the easy prey to a military revolt, conservative in essence. From this blow democracy never recovered in Argentine politics. There are many disperse democratic forces in the country, but no organic democracy.

The book under review shows this with accuracy; and it uses the same accuracy in the appraisal of the administrative organization, both federal and provincial. In this connection it is worth while to point out with Professor Macdonald that Argentina, though a professed federal republic, is growing more and more centralistic in its administrative set-up. As a matter of fact, the indisputable power in Argentina is that wielded by the federal government alone, the provincial governments being but minor satellites. Everything, politically and otherwise, is centered around Buenos Aires, the imperial site of the federal government. In this manner, the long issue between Buenos Aires and the provinces, which apparently was settled by the enactment of the constitution of 1853 and its amendments and the recognition of equal rights for all the members of the confederation, has found, however, a quite different solution from that which was intended. Today Buenos Aires exercises an unchallenged control over the provinces. (Professor Macdonald states that even to be president of the republic a candidate should be a native of Buenos Aires, and illustrates his point by remarking that only two presidents were *provincianos*, namely, Juárez Celman and Justo. Yet he overlooks

Sarmiento and Roca, who were *provincianos* also. Roca served two terms.)

The book contains twenty-three chapters, and there is no important cog in the Argentine administration which does not receive authoritative consideration. No better contribution could have been made toward a good knowledge of the great sister republic of the South.

The University of Texas

PABLO MAX YNSFRAN

Richardson, Rupert Norval, *Texas: The Lone Star State*. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1943, pp. xix, 590.)

The writing of a state history that must meet the requirements of a text book and satisfy and stimulate the lay reader is a difficult task, but Professor Richardson has proved that it can be done. I believe, too, even risking the charge of an overdose of loyalty to Texas, that this book takes first rank in the list of state histories so far published by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

The style of the book is clear and the diction is accurate. The balance between the chapters and between the different periods of Texas history is noteworthy. The maps and charts are excellent. Especial emphasis should be placed on the thirty illustrations with which this book is embellished. As well as I can determine, eleven of the illustrations are reproductions made from oil paintings and expensive engravings of Texas scenes, and about half of these are done by artists who are or were resident in Texas. These illustrations are well chosen and are correctly placed throughout the book to serve their purpose. The binding, print, and craftsmanship are not only in keeping with the lasting qualities of this book but are indicative of the care with which it was produced. For all of the good features both the author and publisher are to be commended.

In six chapters covering one hundred forty-three pages the story carries the reader through the Texas Revolution. One chapter each encompasses the political narrative of Texas as a republic and as an antebellum state, but chapters nine and ten, in their discussion of immigration and extension of settlement and of pioneer institutions, also cover this period of twenty-five years. Chapters eleven through thirteen relate the story of secession, war, reconstruction, and political recovery. The constitution of 1876 with amendments has served the people of Texas for a long while. The next three chapters deal with such subjects as the advance of the cattlemen's frontier, new foundations as evidenced in politics, public poverty (the state debt), law enforcement against all sorts of "bad

men"—Mexican marauders, cattle rustlers, horse thieves, bank robbers, and fence cutters—on the frontier, and public education in the new public

school system and the state's first three publicly supported institutions of higher learning, The Agricultural and Mechanical College, Sam Houston Normal Institute, and The University of Texas. One-third of the space is devoted to a treatise of the period since 1898, and in this treatise Professor Richardson must have encountered the hardest part of his work. It becomes relatively more difficult to evaluate events the nearer they approach the present. It is not easy to get the correct perspective of contemporary and near-contemporary events and movements. The author shows rare skill in separating the real grains of historical truth from the huge piles of chaff. Appropriately, very appropriately, and in a fashion that will strike a responsive chord, Professor Richardson has ended his book with "The Eyes of Texas." Verily, many a reader will finish this book with a song in his heart.

The University of Texas

R. L. BIESELE

O'Rourke, Vernon A., and Campbell, Douglas W., *Constitution Making in a Democracy, Theory and Practice in New York State*. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943, pp. xiii., 286.)

Here is a penetrating and realistic examination of the political forces at work in New York State's 1938 Constitutional Convention by authors who neither argue for the abolition of the constitutional convention nor agree that it should be "taken out of politics." Contending that the "supposed practice of constitution-making has been deduced too much for abstract theory, rather than from empirical data," the authors proceed to examine the constitutional convention as a part of democracy's experience on the premise that "democracy will gain from realistic analyses of its working instruments" and "suffer from the perpetuation of abstract doctrines which ignore or deny the realities of democracy in action."

Because of a provision of the New York State Constitution directing submission to the electorate every twentieth year of the issue of a convention, the action of the electorate in calling the convention "did not depend upon action by some other agency of government, but only upon the calendar." The political results of this situation are detailed in a chapter called "Constitution-Making by the Calendar." Followed by splendidly prepared chapters dealing with "Job Politics at the Convention," "Party Strategy at the Convention," and "Pressure Politics at the Convention," the authors conclude in a chapter on "The Convention as a Legislative Body" that "it is difficult to distinguish the New York Constitutional Convention from a typical session of the state legislature." To be sure, there were some differences. "The convention was a unicameral body. Its jurisdiction was broader. Its membership, in the

main, was drawn from different sources. Compared to the legislature the convention suffered from a chronic lack of responsible and effective leadership, at the same time enduring rougher handling by the organized pressures that besieged it." But, in the main, the convention "could easily have passed for its technically inferior sister, the legislature. The convention was organized by the majority party. Key party and legislative officials manned its committees and acted as floor leaders. Patronage was dispensed according to principles well established by legislative practice. The very rules of convention procedure were taken over bodily from the New York Senate. Weeks of inactivity during the first two months of the convention's life sharply contrast with the last three weeks when a flood of proposals was speedily disposed of amid scenes of confusion which practically every state legislature reenacts annually or biennially. And, finally, in both the convention and the legislature, party politics and pressure groups, mixed in varying quantities, constituted the primary forces guiding the deliberations and producing concrete results."

The authors believe that neither anti-politics symbols and theories nor mechanical devices to bypass political forces will achieve more effective functioning of constitution-making. Rather, they suggest as possible approaches a "more informed public and a more responsible leadership" noting that a greater lapse of time between adjournment of the convention and popular voting as well as less legalistic and formal presentation of the convention's product to the voters might contribute to these ends. Also recommended is a technically efficient "constitutional revision committee" which might function much as legislative councils on a different level.

The book reflects a great deal of investigation and careful analysis; the reader will find it exceedingly well written and without the dullness that frequently mars good case studies.

The University of Texas

HOWARD A. CALKINS

Sheedy, Ann T., *Bartolus on Social Conditions*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 267.)

A previous reviewer characterizes this book in these words:

"This monograph is obviously based on a thorough knowledge of the primary sources, and there has been extensive reading of the secondary writings as the bibliography shows. Unfortunately, Sheedy has provided very little comment of her own, and does not seem to have used the interpretive leads available in the secondary literature. The book is a valuable reference, of course, for those interested in the period, but it carries a distinctly antiquarian aroma."

With this judgment this reviewer is in complete agreement. It is unfair to criticize a writer for not doing that which he did not undertake, but it is permissible to ask whether a given book should ever have been written. And one is led to wonder why this work was ever undertaken.

The book consists of nine chapters. Chapter One is a brief account of the "Life and Writings of Bartolus," a famous jurist and teacher of 14th century Italy. In the remaining eight chapters, the writings of Bartolus,—classified as commentaries, questions, tracts, and opinions—are used as sources from which the author undertakes to quarry information on social conditions in Italy of the 14th century. There are chapters on "The Family," "The City," "Nobles and Nobility," "Students and Doctors," "The Sentiment of Religion," "Franciscan Poverty," and "Heretics and Jews."

The results of the investigation are rather well-stated in the author's own words:

"From the writings of Bartolus it is not possible to obtain a complete picture of social conditions of the period in which he lived. Such information as they furnish is introduced in stating a case or in pointing a solution of a legal problem. For that reason the works of the jurist must be interpreted in the light of information obtained from other historical sources."

To the foregoing it seems possible to add that it might be better to forget Bartolus and go directly to the "other historical sources" if one has any interest in the social conditions of 14th century Italy.

The University of Texas

REX D. HOPPER

Link, Eugene Perry, *Democratic—Republican Societies, 1790-1800.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xii., 256.)

Students of American political theory and American practical politics, alike, will welcome this scholarly and detailed account of the development, organization, and aims of the democratic societies which arose in the United States during the period of Federalist supremacy in the last decade of the 18th century. The writer, after a tireless search, has uncovered the records of 42 such organizations which came into being spontaneously in no less than 13 states, and which were most numerous in Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, and Vermont.

While in part inspired by the examples of the Revolutionary committees of correspondence and the various societies which were formed during the period of the Articles of Confederation, these organizations of the 1790's owed much to the English reform societies and to the political clubs of the French Revolution. In the main, however, they

were born of the times in the United States and were established largely by "farmers, artisans, tradesmen, and sailors, among others, in the spirit of '76" and were a demonstration of "mass opposition to the anti-democratic tendencies of the period." In the opinion of the author, the traditional view is untrue that "the loud voice of dissidence that arose in the 1790's" was "aberration from fundamental American principles, the result in large part of the subversive activities of French origin." The men who were active in these organizations were motivated mainly by a fear that the liberal gains of the American Revolution were in danger of being swept aside by the regime of Hamilton and his co-partisans. Also, the thesis that our early democracy largely came out of the West is dealt an additional blow.

The treatment of every aspect of these societies is thorough—their appearance, their power, their membership, their philosophy, and their permanent effect. One is impressed by their usually sober and serious character and by their staunch acceptance of fundamental democratic principles which later became unexceptionable as a part of our system of popular government. In their ideas we can find the sturdy foundation stones of our democratic philosophy, and in their organization and procedure the real beginnings of our national habit of broad popular discussion and of our democratic party organization. There can be little doubt that considerable light has been thrown upon a long-neglected period in the history of the emergence of American democracy.

The University of Texas

O. DOUGLAS WEEKS

McKay, Seth Shepard, *Seven Decades of the Texas Constitution of 1876*.  
(Publisher and date of publication not given, pp. 245.)

The author has previously contributed two excellent books dealing with the Texas Constitution of 1876 in his *Making the Texas Constitution of 1876* and *Debates in the Texas Constitutional Convention of 1875*. The present study, notwithstanding its not too appropriate title, is predominantly a survey of the same subject matter. Four of the five chapters, a total of 172 pages, deal respectively with the antecedents of the Constitution, calling the Convention, the Convention of 1875, and ratification of the Constitution. Only the final chapter, with some thirty pages, deals with the "seven decades" since 1876. The treatment here is one of examining the amendment experience to 1942 and the efforts during the period considered to secure a new constitution. Also an appendix lists by articles and sections of the Constitution amendments which have been submitted to the voters and the votes by which they were adopted or defeated.

While one may wish that more attention could have been given to the Texas Constitution in practice since 1876, this informative treatment in

a single volume by one who knows his subject well should prove of much value in acquainting its readers with some of the realism behind the "venerable" document, both as to the forces which motivated its formulation and adoption and those which have demanded change.

With no desire to detract from the general value of the study, attention should be called to minor errors which were obviously committed in the difficult task of summarizing constitutional changes through amendment. It is stated (p. 184) that "of the thirty-five legislative amendments proposed by the legislature nineteen were defeated, fifteen adopted, and one was never submitted." The appendix correctly shows nineteen to have been *adopted* and fifteen to have been *defeated*. The observation is also made (p. 187) that "The article on counties was changed in two particulars following the submission of amendments in 1933. The Legislature was authorized to create new counties and change the boundaries of existing counties, and . . ." This amendment was proposed but not adopted.

The University of Texas

HOWARD A. CALKINS

Woytinski, W. S., *Earnings and Social Security in the United States*.  
(Washington: Committee on Social Security, Social Research Council, 1943, pp. xiii, 260.)

There are few if any of the enterprises of our national government which are of more importance to the majority of citizens than the effort to provide social security. Upon the success of this effort depends the economic well-being of practically all industrial workers who live to be sixty-five. It is therefore of prime importance that every possible precaution be taken to guarantee the successful operation of the social security system.

Such a guarantee depends, in the first instance, upon the availability of extensive and accurate information regarding wages, incomes, age distribution of the population, dependency, and other relevant factors. The book under review undertakes to collect and present such information in usable form. Following a discussion of method, the author divides his work into three main headings, "Taxable Wages in the National Income," "Structure of Wages," and "Wage Trends and Social Security." Each of these subjects is treated from numerous angles. In addition to the facts, there are pertinent explanations of their significance for social security in America. Numerous tables and charts are included.

The book is essential reading for all administrators, legislators and citizens who wish to understand the problem of social security as it relates to the national income.

The University of Texas

CARL M. ROSENQUIST

Sister M. Grace Madeliene, *Monetary and Banking Theories of Jacksonian Democracy*. (Philadelphia: Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, 1943, pp. xii., 186.)

The main factors in the Jacksonian struggle against the Second Bank of the United States are known generally to most American scholars in the fields of history, economics, and political science, but the minutiae of that controversy are for the first time set forth in Sister M. Madeleine's *Monetary and Banking Theories of Jacksonian Democracy*. Sister Madeleine has culled the multitudinous newspaper sources and added the products of that search to the body of material already known about the banking theories of the Jacksonian era.

The hopes and aspirations of frontier farmers and merchants were defended by the doughty old Tennessean; those hopes and aspirations were products of frontier debtor psychology. And this era may well be linked with that at the end of the century and with that which prevailed in the United States after "Black Friday" of 1929. All feature the yearning for security, for a modicum of prosperity, and for liberation from the clutches of a financial hierarchy.

One of the book's real contributions is an extensive bibliography.

University of Oklahoma

CORTEZ A. M. EWING

## Book Notes

*Wartime Government in Operation* (Philadelphia: The Blakistone Company, 1943, pp. xiii, 109.) by William H. Nichols and John A. Vieg is a review of wartime government in its relation to the selected fields of manpower and food. The authors limit their discussion to the first twenty months of the participation of the United States in the present war as an active belligerent. Dealing with each field separately, the authors review briefly the developments before Pearl Harbor; they follow with a statement of the record since that time. Then they analyze the factors underlying the development of the policies of the Executive and of Congress. They conclude that the shortcomings of the governmental program in these two fields result from improper attitudes on the part of Congress, the Executive, and the Public, and the inadequacy of the governmental machinery. Thus they reiterate what many have said before—the members of Congress are more sectionally than nationally minded. They also criticize the Executive for failing to develop an administrative system free of internal quarrels. The Public is not free to blame due to its general apathy and its insistence that its Congressmen promote the special interests of their districts. In addition to recommending changes in the attitudes of the three groups mentioned the authors call for thoroughgoing reorganization of the administrative services and for the formulation of a Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War and a Legislative Cabinet. The suggested changes offer nothing new to students of government. Roland Young in *This is Congress* was presented the case for a Legislative Cabinet with considerable force. The lack of coordination and cooperation in the present administration has also received considerable attention as have suggestions for remedying that situation. Within the limitations of the space at their disposal the authors might well have omitted discussion of that which has been dealt with elsewhere and have afforded themselves additional space for a more detailed analysis of agricultural and labor policy.      W.L.S.

In *Collective Security* (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1943, pp. 63), Senator Joseph H. Ball of Minnesota states his case for the participation of the United States in an effective international government organization. The minimal essential of a collective security system according to the Senator is an international agency with power (1) to settle disputes over boundaries, treatment of minority groups, violation of international law, and violation of the pact creating the agency itself, (2) to stop by economic sanction and force of arms attempts at aggression. Senator Ball is of the opinion that when war is outlawed it will be possible to settle all political and economic problems that have so often resulted in war. This assumption is open to serious question. A more comprehensive grasp of the post-war problem is found in *Outline of the*

*Future* (Chicago: World Citizens Association, 1943, pp. 124), by Henri Bonnet, who is convinced that an international organization based on superior force alone cannot expect to survive after this war. Mr. Bonnet believes that the beginning of a pattern of international organization after the war can be found in the cooperative agencies that have been organized by the United Nations. Thus out of military cooperation in the war a genuine system of collective security can result. The operation of Lend-Lease and several of the Combined Boards in Washington point the way to the operation of new principles in the expansion of production and the wider exchange and distribution of goods. If the existing agencies are expanded and their functions increased it will be possible—in the author's opinion—to develop gradually an effective international government.

W.L.S.

At the request of the Governor, the Kentucky Department of Revenue has prepared for the period of the present Chief Executive's administration a special report which effectively presents the tax administration problem of the commonwealth during the pre-war and war years. The document was not prepared for general circulation, but the newspapers talked about it and led the public to request copies. The Department has issued a limited edition in mimeographed form. (*Report of Department Revenue, 1939-1943*, Kentucky Department of Revenue, Frankfort, 1943). The report tells something of the revenue system, but places primary emphasis on the operations of the Department and on the results of this work. Despite the fact that two Commissioners have been called into the military service, the report shows that the Department has maintained a consistent tax administration policy which has enlisted taxpayer cooperation. Notwithstanding the heavy personnel turnover, the increased volume of work has been processed with an actually reduced number of mostly inexperienced workers. Some particular difficulties are pointed out bluntly. For instance, the Department is having little success in maintaining its audit staff despite the fact that income tax audits alone have yielded directly more than \$1,600,000 in addition to the revenue brought about later by helping taxpayers get straightened out on questionable points. Some of the specific means of economy which have enabled the Department to sustain efficiency and cut costs in a period of rising prices are described. There is an equally telling description of the non-revenue functions performed by the Department. The two most significant of these are administration of alcoholic beverage control and of the county finance supervision program of Kentucky. Unlike the well-illustrated Annual Reports, this document lacks pictures and graphs or charts.

J.W.M.

*War and Peace Aims of the United Nations* (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1943, pp. xv., 730), edited by Louise W. Holborn, is a col-

lection of the utterances of responsible United Nations spokesmen on the topic indicated in the title for the period 1939 through the end of 1942. The documents are divided into seven groups. The first consists of the statements issued jointly by two or more of the United Nations. The other six chapters are statements on war and peace aims enunciated by individual countries. These countries are grouped as follows: the United States of America, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, the Occupied Countries, the American Republics. Within each geographical grouping the documents are arranged chronologically. The documents are the utterances of the responsible formulators of foreign policy in each state. For instance, in the chapter on the U. S., the persons quoted include such names as Roosevelt, Hull, Welles, Winant, Jos. Grew, Jr. The editor confines herself to a one-page editor's note. An introduction by Hajo Holborn takes up another four pages. The remaining seven hundred pages are strictly a collection of documents. Clearly the book is not light non-fiction for the average reader; however, the value to the specialized student of international relations of having all these statements of war and peace aims conveniently bound between two covers is self-evident.

D.S.S.

C. Grove Haines' and Ross J. S. Hoffman's *The Origins and Background of the Second World War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1943, pp. v., 659) is a textbook in which the authors state that modern history presents a record of two great opposing forces: "an immense effort to integrate the human race in a system of orderly relations, and a ceaseless resistance to that effort." Factors making for disorder are: political and economic nationalism, racialism, the crisis in liberal democracy, and the totalitarian challenge. Four introductory chapters sketch the course of history from the First World War to Versailles. Other important chapters are: "The United States and World Organization," "Seeds of Anarchy," "The Deterioration of Security," "Disruption of World Economic Relations," "The Nazi Revolution," "The Axis Offensive." Adequate classified bibliographies, fifteen maps, a satisfactory index, good printing, and an easy style make the reader's task pleasant.

R.H.R.

Political party handbooks are a common phenomenon in a democratic country. In general, such documents are of no particular significance. In the case of the *Democratic Campaign Handbook*, General Election, 1943 (Kentucky), somewhat the traditional pattern is followed until page 14, after which there is a 50-page examination of the state government's progress during the past several years—that is, during the 12-year period since the last Republican Governor's term ended. It is the last part of the pamphlet which merits comment. The handbook con-

stitutes a running account of the state government of Kentucky for the past dozen years, particularly for the past four years; and as report writing it would do credit to the government itself. The text is simple, straight-forward, and without the usual glowing superlatives. It is rendered attractive by a series of photographs and charts which present the larger aspects of the state government's recent history in an effective and clear-cut fashion.

J.W.M.

Of interest to those who need a supplementary text for courses in American government, or as the basis for a course on wartime government in the United States is *Current American Government* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1943, pp. vii., 357) by L. Vaughan Howard and Hugh A. Bone. Dealing with the principal developments brought about by the war, chapters are devoted to diplomacy, the presidency, administrative organization, the federal service, Congress, political parties and pressure groups, civil liberties and war information, alien enemies and alien property, wartime finance, industrial mobilization and control, labor, military policy and organization, federal-state-local relations, the post-war planning. The material is very well organized and clearly presented.

H.A.C.

*The Financing of Public Schools in Michigan* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942, pp. 139) by E. Fenton Shepard and William B. Wood is a description and analysis of public education financing in Michigan with particular reference to the public elementary and secondary schools. The fiscal importance of education, the expansion of state and federal aid, and principles which condition public support of schools are examined as a background for a detailed discussion of state aid for education in Michigan and the pointing up of more immediate problems which have a bearing on public school financing. Appendices present the principal duties of educational agencies in Michigan and financial data for fifteen counties selected so as to represent the chief types of economic areas and school districts in the state. H.A.C.

The fifth edition of *The Book of the States*, 1943-44 (Chicago: The Council of State Governments, 1943, pp. xii., 508) brings up to date information on state governmental organization and activities, and reports the work during the past biennium of the Council of State Governments, the commissions on interstate cooperation, and national organizations affiliated with the Council. War effects on state governments are noted at greater length than in the fourth edition, and less reference material is included on highways, other public works construction, and relief expenditures. Like previous editions, this publication with anticipated supplements will be indispensable to those in need of an authoritative source of information on the American states. H.A.C.

*Alabama's State Dollar* (Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama, 1942, pp. vii., 135) by Joseph M. Ray describes the pattern of Alabama disbursements and receipts for the four-year period from 1938 through 1941 for the purpose of estimating the effects of current and probable future developments. Suggesting that Alabama may soon feel the need for financial readjustment, the fiscal structure is considered to be ill designed because of excessive funding and pro-rating to bear the stress of such readjustment in crisis. Available avenues for Alabama fiscal policy to follow during the war are recommended with attention to tax policy, spending policy, debt service, and surpluses.

H.A.C.

*National Consciousness* (Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1943, pp. x., 168) by Walter Sulzbach, with an introduction by Hans Kohn, is an able analysis of this all-pervading fact of the 19th and 20th centuries. In the words of the author: "National Consciousness is by far the most important force in modern times. Religion does not influence men so profoundly; and in times of stress even class solidarity has yielded to nationalism." The main aspects of nationalism considered are:—"national character," "what is a nation?", "home and homeland," "the fighting impulse," "national honor," "imperialism," and "a secular religion." Closing chapters treat of the fundamental causes and consequences and the future of nationalism.

O.D.W.

*The Legislature of California* (San Francisco, 1943, pp. 350), prepared by the Commonwealth Club of California under the direction of C. C. Young, Director, is what the subtitle indicates "A Factual Study of the California Legislature, Together With the Legislatures of Other States." Useful though it may be for students of California government, the comparative material on the lawmaking bodies of all the states, which is introduced as a part of each of the ten chapters into which the book is divided, will be of interest to students of state governments and legislation in general. The summaries of recent development in all the states are excellent. The bibliography consulted is quite comprehensive and up-to-date.

O.D.W.

*Group Experience* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943, pp. xix., 218), by Bernice Baxton and Rosalind Cassidy, describes several cases of group organization and of the emergence and functioning of leaders in group situations. The results are generalized into something approaching a theoretical framework, intended as a guide for directors of youth organizations in particular and for teachers and educators in general. The book shows a laudable attempt to avoid the enthusiastic vagueness characteristic of many works on leadership. An excellent bibliography is appended.

C.M.R.

A new edition of *Essentials of American Government* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1943, pp. viii., 649) by Frederic A. Ogg and P. Orman Ray has been published. Maintaining its usual high standard, it has been considerably revised with the introduction of much new material and an expansion of the treatment of foreign relations and national defense together with some rearrangement.

O. D. W.